1. MOMENT OF SILENCE

2. ROLL CALL

3. MOTION TO GO INTO CLOSED SESSION

THAT a closed meeting of Council be held on Wednesday, March 23, 2011 at 6:00 p.m. in Waterloo County Room in accordance with Section 239 of the Municipal Act, 2001, for the purposes of considering the following subject matters:

   a) potential litigation in relation to a proceeding before an administrative tribunal
   b) receiving of legal advice subject to solicitor-client privilege pertaining to the interpretation of a statute in relation to a municipal project
   c) potential litigation and receiving of legal advice subject to solicitor-client privilege in relation to a proceeding before an administrative tribunal
   d) proposed or pending acquisition of land in the City of Waterloo

4. MOTION TO RECONVENE IN OPEN SESSION

5. DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY INTEREST UNDER THE MUNICIPAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT

6. PRESENTATIONS

   a) Gail Kaufman Carlin, Director and Marilee Mark, Chair Re: Sunnyside Foundation Recognition

7. PETITIONS

8. DELEGATIONS

   a) Maureen Innes, Waterloo Re: Quality of Life on Residents Backing on to the Ira Needles Corridor

9. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

   a) Budget – February 23, 2011
   b) Budget Public Input – February 23, 2011
   c) Closed Council – February 23, 2011
   d) Council – February 23, 2011
   e) Closed Committee – March 8, 2011
f) Planning & Works Public Input – March 8, 2011  
g) Planning & Works – March 8, 2011  
h) Administration & Finance – March 8, 2011  
i) Community Services – March 8, 2011  
j) Planning & Works Public Input – March 8, 2011  
k) All Council – March 10, 2011

10. COMMUNICATIONS

a) Grand River Accessibility Advisory Committee to Ministry of Community and Social Services, Re: Integrated Accessibility Standards

11. MOTION TO GO INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER REPORTS

12. REPORTS

Finance Reports

a) F-11-015, T2011-004 St. Agatha Trunk Watermain Erb's Road (Wilmot Line to Notre Dame Drive) Township of Wilmot  
b) F-11-016, P2011-05 Control System Retrofit at 99 Regina St., Waterloo

Committee Reports

a) Planning & Works - attached & marked PS-110308  
b) Administration & Finance - attached & marked FS-110308  
c) Community Services - attached & marked SS-110308

Chief Administrative Officer  
Regional Chair  
Regional Clerk

a) CR-CLK-11-006, Response to Ministry of Community and Social Services on Proposed AODA Integrated Accessibility Standard

13. OTHER MATTERS UNDER COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

a) E-11-035, Noise Assessment Review for Properties on Grange Court, Pitfield Court, Cardiff Street and Heathcliffe Place Backlotting onto Ira Needles Boulevard  
b) Memo: Ontario Works Caseload: February 2011

14. MOTION FOR COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO RISE AND COUNCIL RESUME

15. MOTION TO ADOPT PROCEEDINGS OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

16. MOTIONS
17. **NOTICE OF MOTION**

   a) TAKE NOTICE THAT I, Councillor Sean Strickland, intend to introduce the following Motion at the Council Meeting on March 23, 2011:

   Whereas the recent commercial development along Ira Needles Blvd. known as the "Boardwalk" has been generally positive for the community and

   Whereas according to a recent noise study conducted by regional staff indicated that increased traffic patterns along Ira Needles Blvd. have increased decibel levels more quickly than planned and

   Whereas noise levels are only expected to increase over time due to expansion of commercial development to 1 million sq. ft. of retail space and

   Whereas a new residential development on the East side of Ira Needles immediately to the North of the streets in question and also along the East side are receiving noise barriers funded by the developer as per Regional policy and

   Whereas the long term residents along Grange Crescent, Pittfield Place, Heathcliffe Place, and Cardiff St, have every much a right to enjoy their properties and be protected from unreasonable noise as those who are just moving into the neighbourhood, and therefore

   Let it be resolved that the Region of Waterloo install, at the Region’s expense, a noise attenuation wall along the easterly side of Ira Needles Blvd. extending from University Ave. Northbound in such a manner to optimize noise protection for residential properties, not limited to, but including, Grange Crescent, Pittfield Place, Heathcliffe Place, and Cardiff St.

18. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

19. **OTHER BUSINESS**

20. **QUESTIONS**

21. **ENACTMENT OF BY-LAWS – FIRST, SECOND & THIRD READINGS**

   a) A By-law to Establish Fees and Charges for the Regional Municipality of Waterloo and Repeal By-law 10-001, As Amended

   b) A By-law to Appoint an Acting Medical Officer of Health When the Medical Officer of Health and Associate Medical Officer of Health for the Waterloo Health Unit are Absent or Unable to Act and to Repeal By-law 04-008

   c) A By-law to Confirm the Actions of Council – March 23, 2011

22. **ADJOURN**

Members absent: J. Wideman

DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST UNDER THE MUNICIPAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT

R. Deutschmann declared a non-pecuniary interest with respect to discussions of rapid transit, and with respect to the Regional Transportation Master Plan owing to the numerous linkages between the Plan and development of rapid transit, due to he and his spouse being shareholders of corporations that have an interest in a property at 10 Duke Street West, Kitchener.

OPENING REMARKS (T. Galloway)

Chair T. Galloway provided an overview of the business to be taken up at the meeting, including decisions on user rates, presentations, and responses from staff to Councillors’ requests.

*J. Haalboom entered the meeting at 1:18 p.m.

PRESENTATIONS

Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) Budget Update

J. Mitchell, as Chair of GRCA, made a presentation to the Committee. She provided an overview of the organization as well as of issues of concern to the GRCA, including flood control and the GRCA budget. The presentation included footage of the 1974 flood in Galt, and of recent floods in Australia.

Joe Farwell, Chief Administrative Officer of GRCA, introduced Nancy Davy, Director, Resource Management and Sonja Radoja, Manager of Corporate Services. He provided a presentation to the Committee on the GRCA budget update and draft budget, including:

- Origin and history of GRCA;
- Responsibilities and operations of GRCA;
- $9.90 per capita municipal levy;
- Water management plans, including update of 1982 study of watershed issues;
- Budget 2011 timetables;
• Budgeted expenditures and revenues for 2011, with detailed breakdowns of each;
• Special projects undertaken by GRCA;
• Large water management capital projects and recreational capital programs;
• Funding issues for the GRCA, including special grants and reserves; and
• Details of general municipal levy.

The presentation, as well as the GRCA draft budget, is attached to the original minutes.

The Committee asked about the prospects for provincial funding related to source water protection being continued once the current funding expires in March 2012. J. Farwell indicated that GRCA is not optimistic of the continuation of funding, and that a reduction in programming or increase in costs to municipalities could be possible; he observed that some staff positions are tied to the funding in question.

The Committee inquired as to what proportion of the funding in question is spent in the Region. J. Farwell affirmed that GRCA will provide the information to Regional staff.

The Committee ascertained from Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services, that the province is funding technical studies for and development of a watershed-wide source protection plan. The plan is currently being developed and costs related to its implementation will be determined as development of the plan proceeds. It is anticipated that implementation costs related to the Region’s water supplies would be funded by user rates. He noted that funding for the Rural Water Quality Program, including the fence program and manure management initiatives, comes from user rates. Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Housing and Community Services, indicated that the Regional Official Plan included liaison with GRCA to ensure that the plan is current, and that the greatest impacts would be at the level of area municipalities.

*C. Zehr left the meeting at 1:39 p.m.

The Committee asked about the involvement of the Region in studies related to source water protection, and T. Schmidt responded that the Region is involved with Tier 3 studies which are expected to be completed in 2012 and for which provincial funding has been received.

The Committee confirmed with S. Radoja that over two dozen people constituting a total of 8.7 FTEs would be impacted by the cessation of provincial funding for source water protection, and J. Farwell noted the potential for impacts on staff. T. Schmidt indicated that more than $2 million is in place in the user rate budget for implementation of the source protection study findings.

The Committee asked if the GRCA could participate in group initiatives with the Region and learned from Larry Ryan, Chief Financial Officer, that GRCA is part of a purchasing cooperative with area municipalities and other local institutions, and participates in group buying on a volunteer basis. Staff will take expansion of such activities under advisement.

The Committee requested information from staff regarding properties that benefit from GRCA programs but are not part of the municipal water system and so do not pay user fees, as well as the potential for introducing a levy on such properties. The Committee requested that staff and GRCA examine the grants given to property owners for remediation and the correlation of properties paying user fees with those grants. T. Schmidt clarified that the source protection plan program will relate to the protection of municipal wells and municipal water supply sources, and not broad source protection. It was noted that municipal systems rather than private systems have the greatest impact upon the Grand River, which provides the rationale for charging the GRCA levy through the user rates. J. Farwell commented that provincial grants
are available to landowners to carry out action that benefits themselves and their neighbours, as well as Regional programs striving toward the same goal, and noted the desirability of such programs.

**USER RATES**

L. Ryan provided a presentation on user rates in the 2011 Regional Budget, including:

- Historic water rates;
- Ten year capital program for water, with debenture financing;
- Details of ten year water user rate model;
- Trends in water consumption, with attendant pressure on rates;
- Comparison of per capita consumption of integrated and two-tier water systems;
  - Trend of decline across all municipalities;
  - Region has second lowest in per capita usage in Ontario;
- Annual household impact of water rate increase is $10.67; and
- Comparison of household consumption and budgeted rates for 2010-11 between selected upper-tier municipalities.

The Committee noted the relationship between user rates, water/wastewater consumption, the capital program and future planned debentures to fund capital works. The Committee debated the balance in the base budget with respect to the user rates proposed and the levels of future debentures. It was noted that conservation and education programs are working well to bring about reduced volumes, and that raising user rates to compensate for lower volumes of usage may complicate the messages and incentives related to conservation activity. L. Ryan provided a detailed overview of the ten-year water rate model, with details on annual debentures and user fee revenues, and indicating that the proposed model would have water distribution operating on a breakeven basis in 2013; he noted that the rate structure arose from a menu of options for combining user rate increases and debentures presented to Budget Committee in previous years, and that the model is reviewed annually. Members of the Committee expressed opinions that the proposed rate for 2011 could be changed, and that a review of the long term model and funding options could occur during the 2012 budget process.

The Committee asked what an appropriate balance for the capital reserve would be, and L. Ryan responded that compared to other municipalities the Region's balance is relatively low.

The Committee addressed the timing of approvals for user rates and the GRCA, noting the linkage of the former in funding the latter. L. Ryan observed that the figures provided for budgeting purposes are estimates, and that deviations between budgeted and actual amounts in previous years are accounted for in future budgets. Members of the Committee suggested that the process could be changed to better align the approval process of the two items.

*C. Zehr entered the meeting at 2:24 p.m.

The Committee obtained clarification on water volume projections beyond 2011 from T. Schmidt, noting that projections incorporate changes in usage and rates, and attempts to balance increases in capital expenditures by drawing from reserve funds. He observed that reducing user rates would increase eventual debentures and would lead to a higher overall cost in the long-term, owing to the carrying costs for debentures issued. For Wellesley and North Dumfries, no debentures are planned for water capital projects because no large projects are present in those capital programs as there are in other areas in the Region.
The Committee asked whether water conservation programs would continue, given the upward pressure on user rates that results from lower volumes. Mike Murray, Chief Administrative Officer, noted the Region’s significant history of water conservation initiatives, as well as the benefits of lower water volumes, namely savings via deferral of costly capital projects. T. Schmidt observed that the trend of lower water usage is Canada-wide and occurs in municipalities both with and without efficiency programs, owing to increased awareness of the benefits of conservation initiatives. The Committee expressed that the Region should be cognizant of penalizing consumers who are taking the initiative to reduce water usage, as well as of other financial pressures that are felt by residents.

**Water Supply**

MOVED by K. Seiling
SECONDED by R. Kelterborn

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve for Water Supply, the 2011 Operating Budget, the 2011 Capital Budget and the 2012-2020 Capital Forecast.

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve a Regional Water Rate of $0.7775 per cubic metre effective March 1, 2011 and that the necessary by-law be introduced.

CARRIED

**PRESENTATIONS**

*Waterloo Regional Police Service Budget Update*

Matt Torigian, Chief, Waterloo Regional Police Service, provided an introduction to the Police Services presentation, including:

- Incongruence of police services levels with demands of community;
- New budget issues - request for funds to hire 60 new officers;
- Use of Patrol Staffing Analysis to analyze policing needs;
- Use of performance metrics as a basis for budget issues; and
- Introducing members of the senior command.

Joe Steiner, Director of Finance, made a presentation on the Police Services budget, including

- 2011 base budget operating adjustments;
- Expansion items - request for additional staff/equipment;
- Tax rate impact of 0.57% before addition of staff, based on 2.15% assessment growth;
- Detailed review of budget line items;
- Detailed overview of requested staff; and
- Total budget position of 1.07% after proposed staff increases.

The presentation is attached to the original minutes.

The Committee asked whether additional staff increases beyond those proposed would be required in the future. M. Torigian responded that the proposed staff increases are considered to be the appropriate number for the demand observed in the community with the aim of meeting demand fully by 2012 and assessing staffing requirements afterward as per usual. He noted that the intake of the proposed new recruits would be staggered to be congruent with the
capacity of the Police College, and that once the officers are trained one could expect increased visibility of patrol officers. Approximately 12 officers would staff a typical shift in Cambridge.

M. Torigian elaborated for the Committee on the methodology of deploying police resources, noting performance measures and targets and the use of similar methodologies in other municipalities in Canada and the United States. He noted that the need for more officers was identified in previous years but that the Police delayed making a request until the metrics could verify the requirements. He indicated that the phase-in period for new officers could be adjusted, and affirmed that the Region would maintain the lowest cost of policing per capita of the largest municipalities in Canada.

The Committee clarified that prevention of crime is a priority and considered a core function of policing, with M. Torigian noting that proactive time for officers is considered critical for mitigation of crime. He observed that approximately $7 is saved for every dollar allocated to crime prevention, and listed prevention initiatives including the Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council and school resource officers working with young people.

The Committee confirmed that the 2010 police budget has a preliminary surplus of less than $1 million, which would appear to arise from increased revenues. The Committee discussed with J. Steiner the pay of incoming recruits and the pay scale of officers generally.

*T. Cowan left the meeting at 3:24 p.m.

The Committee asked the implications if the proposed new hires were not approved, and M. Torigian responded that the evidence shows that the police are at a critical point on the front line citing increases in various categories of crime. He indicated that while a proportion of crime is committed by non-residents, no definitive figures are currently available. He also provided details on walking patrols in the Cambridge area.

The Committee remarked upon the proposed hiring, confirming with M. Torigian that information from the queuing model is driving the request for hires to increase proactive time among all officers. The Committee affirmed that independent review/audit of the processed data from the queuing model would be desirable to ensure its accuracy, and indicated that the Police Services Board might benefit from such analysis.

The Committee asked whether the restructuring of police engaged in investigative activity are proving effective. M. Torigian responded that clearance rates and crime solving are improved. He confirmed that the Police Association is involved in a committee to arrange staffing to align with fluctuations in service needs.

The Committee noted that recent surveys suggests that residents perceive crime to be generally occurring at the same or lesser levels than in the past, which would conflict with the conclusions arrived at via the computing model. M. Torigian responded that criminal activity varies geographically throughout the Region, that unreported crime is observed to be increasing, and reaffirmed the conclusions of the model. He noted that police activity such as patrolling industrial areas on non-work hours is the type of activity being forgone with less proactive time for officers.

J. Steiner responded to a query regarding renovations of the Central Division facility, noting that it is an aging building with numerous issues and that the renovations are to maintain the existing facility rather than for expansion purposes.

*S. Strickland left the meeting at 3:48 p.m.
M. Torigian affirmed that the increase in police coverage in Cambridge is due to the greater area to cover in the southern portion of Cambridge, and that the present staffing levels yield lower levels of proactive time than would be considered desirable.

The Committee noted the police demands in Waterloo, particularly in the uptown area and near the universities. M. Torigian noted that retention of paid duty officers to be present in those areas was in contravention of the Police Service Act as well as leading to officer burnout, and so could not continue. He noted that with appropriate staffing, police resources can be allocated where they are required.

A councillor noted their experience with police work in a rural portion of the Region, and related their perception of concerns of residents with regard to patrols and costs.

In response to a Committee observation of perceptions of reduced crime according to recent surveys, M. Torigian asserted that worse comparator municipalities do not necessarily justify the present levels of service, noting that the data on violent crime displays an increase in the area.

The Committee suggested that a crime prevention initiative could include programming in elementary and secondary schools, and M. Torigian responded that the Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police has such a program.

The Committee and M. Torigian discussed the merits of foot patrol as part of police officers' proactive time and crime prevention.

*J. Mitchell left the meeting at 4:11 p.m.

*The Committee recessed at 4:11 p.m., and reconvened at 4:20 p.m.

*C. Millar left the meeting at 4:22 p.m.

L. Ryan resumed his presentation on user rates in the 2011 Regional Budget, including:

- Historic wastewater rates;
- Ten year capital program for wastewater, with debenture financing;
- Details of ten year wastewater user rate model;
- Trends in water consumption, with attendant pressure on rates; and
- Retail wastewater rates.

*S. Strickland re-entered the meeting at 4:24 p.m.

**Wastewater Treatment**

MOVED by K. Seiling
SECONDED by L. Armstrong

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve for Wastewater Treatment, the 2011 Operating Budget, the 2011 Capital Budget and the 2012-2020 Capital Forecast.

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve a Regional Wastewater Rate of $0.6965 per cubic metre effective March 1, 2011 and that the necessary by-law be introduced.

CARRIED (J. Brewer opposed)
**Water Distribution**

MOVED by R. Kelterborn  
SECONDED by L. Armstrong

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the 2011 Operating Budget, the 2011 Capital Budget and the 2012-2020 Capital Forecast for the Retail Water Distribution System.

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve a Retail Water Rate of $1.52 per cubic metre effective March 1, 2011 and that the necessary by-law be introduced.

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve a monthly maintenance fee of $5.00 per account for the customers of the Retail Water Distribution System effective March 1, 2011 and that the necessary by-law be introduced.

CARRIED

**Wastewater Collection**

MOVED by R. Kelterborn  
SECONDED by L. Armstrong

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the 2011 Operating Budget, the 2011 Capital Budget and the 2012-2020 Capital Forecast for the Retail Wastewater Collection System.

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve a Retail Wastewater Rate of $1.35 per cubic metre effective March 1, 2011 and that the necessary by-law be introduced.

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve a monthly maintenance fee of $4.00 per account for the customers of the Retail Wastewater Collection System effective March 1, 2011 and that the necessary by-law be introduced.

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve an increase of 7.9% to the flat annual rate that is currently being charged per residential connection and per commercial/industrial connection for the users of the Wastewater Collection System that do not have a water meter installed effective March 1, 2011 and that the necessary by-law be introduced.

CARRIED

*J. Mitchell re-entered the meeting at 4:34 p.m.*

L. Ryan resumed his presentation on the 2011 Regional Budget, including:

- Areas which may require a base budget adjustment;
  - 2010 gapping;
  - Ontario Works administration costs announcement;
  - Fuel budget;
- Analysis of gapping savings;
- Details of Ontario Works administration costs;
- Fuel inflation, and potential adjustments to budget fuel prices;
- New issues, with prioritization from staff as per Committee direction;
• Budget for Regional Transportation Master Plan; and
• Consumer Price Index.

The Committee obtained clarification on the budget for the Waterloo Region Museum and on the normal spread between the price of gasoline vs. diesel fuel, as well as confirming that figures related to Ontario Works were preliminary.

*C. Millar re-entered the meeting at 4:41 p.m.

The Committee ascertained from R. Horne the plans for the washhouse at Joseph Schneider Haus, as well as elaborating on the budget issue paper related to the cultural heritage coordinator.

The Committee obtained clarification from L. Ryan on the details of the budget issue paper related to Homelessness to Housing Stability strategy, with activities that would be funded.

The Committee clarified that the proposed ongoing 1.25% budget increase for the Regional Transportation Master Plan earmarks those funds for transit expansion generally, and may or may not be allocated to Rapid Transit specifically. He explained how the proposed increase would interact with the funding proposed in previous reports related to Rapid Transit options.

The Committee requested that staff bring a breakdown of the allocation of the Region’s surplus as per Regional policy to the next meeting of the Committee on March 23.

The Committee requested a 3-4 year projection on the impact of Ontario Works caseloads upon the Tax Stabilization Reserve Fund to determine opportunities for supplementary taxes.

The Committee confirmed with L. Ryan that staff hired for stimulus-related projects would be retained through increases in the capital program.

The Committee confirmed that three FTE positions have been eliminated owing to program reviews and internal audit, and M. Murray indicated that the eight program reviews have identified staff reductions, staff increases, and other actions such as implementation of information technology.

The Committee discussed the nature and structure of the budget process and budget deliberations, and the relative differences between the Region and some area municipalities.

The Committee directed that staff make the presentation on Long Term Roads Funding at the March 8th meeting of the Planning & Works Committee.

PROPERTY TAX BUDGET PRESENTATIONS

Ontario Works

David Dirks, Director, Employment and Income Support, provided a presentation on 2011 Social Assistance Costs, including:

• Ontario Disability Support Program caseloads in 2010;
• Ontario Works caseloads in 2010;
• Long-term caseload trends;
• Demographic profile and factors influencing caseloads;
• Projections for 2011 caseload planning;
- Monthly cost per case;
- Budget shortfalls in various projected caseload scenarios, and funding of annual overexpenditure; and
- Expected savings from 2011 uploading.

The presentation is attached to the original minutes.

D. Dirks elaborated for the Committee on activities to support residents receiving social assistance, including promotion of the GED attainment, transit support, and partnering with Conestoga College to deliver programs.

The Committee inquired as to making funding sustainable for financing budget shortfalls related to social assistance. L. Ryan indicated that the costs of the programs are planned to be uploaded fully to the province by 2018, and that the Tax Stabilization Reserve Fund will be utilized as well. D. Dirks added that provincial caseload projections do not go beyond 2012, and that the situation beyond that point is not expected to be favourable. The Committee observed that should the Ontario Works caseload stabilize to the extent that the Tax Stabilization Reserve Fund is no longer needed to fund the high caseloads, the Region could be expected to enjoy a significant financial benefit.

NEXT MEETING – March 23, 2011

MOTION TO GO INTO CLOSED SESSION

MOVED by J. Brewer
SECONDED by S. Strickland

THAT a closed meeting of Council be held on Wednesday, February 23, 2011 at 5:30 p.m. in the Waterloo County Room in accordance with Section 239 of the Municipal Act, 2001, for the purposes of considering the following subject matter:

a) receiving of legal advice subject to solicitor-client privilege pertaining to the interpretation of a statute in relation to a municipal project

CARRIED

COMMITTEE CHAIR, T. Galloway

COMMITTEE CLERK, M. Grivicic

Members absent: J. Wideman

MOTION TO RECONVENE INTO OPEN SESSION

MOVED by C. Millar
SECONDED by B. Halloran

THAT the meeting reconvene into Open Session.

CARRIED

DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST UNDER THE MUNICIPAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT

None declared.

Chair T. Galloway provided opening remarks to the Committee and to those present in the gallery, including an overview of the meeting’s agenda.

DELEGATIONS

a) Mary Jane Patterson, Executive Director, and Rachel D’Aguilar, Energy Services Coordinator, REEP Green Solutions

M. Patterson and R. D’Aguilar spoke to a number of REEP programs and services which are aligned with the Region’s Strategic Plan and various programs, including:

- Goals and vision of REEP;
- Water stewardship initiatives;
- Rainwater initiatives;
- REEP House for Sustainable Living;
- Air quality improvement;
- Energy efficiency services provided by REEP;
- ecoENERGY retrofit for homes; and
- Success and benefits of REEP initiatives.

The delegation requested the Region’s continued support for REEP through the approval of the REEP budget issue paper. The Committee was provided a handout in support of their presentation, which is attached to the original minutes.
b) Tim Sothertn and Tricia Siemens, Supportive Housing of Waterloo re: funding request

T. Siemens expressed support for the budget issue paper related to the Homelessness to Housing Stability.

The delegation provided a history of Supportive Housing of Waterloo, including the group’s activities and achievements. They related a number of success stories in the group’s work, which has yielded a positive response from the community; despite this, the group continues to deal with a highly vulnerable population and would encourage the Region to provide additional support through the 2011 budget.

*T. Cowan entered the meeting at 6:44 p.m.

c) Jason Morris, Kitchener

J. Morris voiced a concern on behalf of himself and his neighbours to exercise greater fiscal restraint in the 2011 budget. He expressed dissatisfaction with spending on non-essential programming, asserting that tax increases are not sustainable. He indicated that a growing number of middle-class residents are discontented with the increases and are considering leaving the Region. He suggested that the Region should differentiate essential programming from non-essential programming, and to communicate proposed budget increases in terms of dollars per $100,000 of assessed property value. He related that he is not convinced that light rail transit is the correct solution for the Region, citing reasons why comparisons between the Region’s proposed rapid transit project and other successful projects are not well made, and offering that expansion of conventional transit on a flat rate equally-shared basis would be a better plan. He noted difficulty in obtaining data on assessments in the Region.

Larry Ryan, Chief Financial Officer, indicated that staff would meet with J. Morris related to issues cited in his delegation.

d) Trudy Beaulne and Michael Hackbusch, Poverty Free Waterloo Region

The delegation provided an overview of Poverty Free Waterloo Region in their presentation to the Committee, speaking in support of budget issues that are related to the social infrastructure of the community, which are identified in their presentation slides. They emphasized the relatively small expenditure of the issues and the various benefits to the community of doing so. They encouraged the Committee to build on existing successes and to support the identified recommended issues and as many as possible of those identified but not recommended.

The presentation is attached to the original minutes.

*S. Strickland left the meeting at 7:05 p.m.

e) Eleanor Grant, Alliance Against Poverty re: funding request

E. Grant circulated a handout to the Committee, which is attached to the original minutes. She provided an overview of the group and its goals, and expressed satisfaction at the Region’s attention to poverty reduction while providing an overview of the magnitude of poverty in the Region. She suggested that the uploading of social assistance costs to the province would evoke an obligation to use the budget savings to reduce poverty. She proposed that the Region:

- Undertake to increase affordable housing;
- Address food insecurity and increase the component of more healthful food in hampers;
- Ensure transit service on all routes every day, to not cut off the mobility of those who depend solely on transit;
- Increase affordable access to transit services; and
- Adopt a living wage policy, including calling on the province to raise minimum wages by 75 cents annually.

The Committee confirmed with E. Grant that additional guidance and education for the public regarding donating more healthful food to food banks and hampers would be of benefit.

f) Cindy Jefferson, Child Care Network of Waterloo Region re: child care fee subsidy

C. Jefferson expressed support for child care subsidy funding, noting the benefits to children obtaining quality care through an increase to the fee subsidy budget. She affirmed the importance of quality in child care, and cited child care anecdotes and initiatives in other jurisdictions. She asserted that the current fee subsidy waiting list results in residents having to forgo community-benefitting activities such as attending school and/or retraining.

g) Greg deGroot-Maggetti, Wendy Adema & Cindy MacRae, Mennonite Central Committee Ontario re: Circle of Friends program

The group circulated a booklet on the Circle of Friends program, which is attached to the original minutes.

The delegation indicated their support for the Region’s past commitments to poverty reduction, and encouraged the Committee to fund the budget issues outlined by Poverty Free Waterloo Region. They noted that the Circle of Friends program received support through the Homelessness to Housing Stability Strategy, and provided an overview of the program including its aims, activities and success stories. They described the activities of Mennonite Central Committee Ontario.

h) Jennifer Mains and Joe Mancini, Working Centre

The delegation expressed support for the Homelessness to Housing Stability issue paper, as it relates to the STEP Home program. They provided background information on the program, including specific activities, and noting that many in the program receive social assistance. They related the benefits to the community of the program, in addition to those directly assisted. The Committee suggested that the police chief could be invited to the program’s meetings to observe the work that is being undertaken.

i) Jennifer Mains, on behalf of Ann Tinker, for the Cambridge Shelter

J. Mains read a statement on behalf of Ann Tinker, citing the success and importance of the Homelessness to Housing Stability Strategy and strongly urging funding for the budget issues paper related to the strategy.

j) Harald Drewitz, Kitchener

H. Drewitz suggested that the budget increases proposed should not account for uploading savings, which does not allow for a suitable comparison of costs and service levels before and after uploading. He noted that taxpayers are under constraint, and that any budget increases
will fall on them. He encouraged the Region to be completely transparent of the costs for services provided by the Region.

k) Tim Mollison, Tri-Cities Transport Action Group

T. Mollison provided background information on the group and its objectives. He spoke to the Regional Transportation Master Plan and suggested that the budget increase for the plan should be introduced at and then maintained at 1.5% annually. He expressed appreciation for the attention of Regional staff for the group’s ideas, and suggested that overnight service on the iXpress route should be considered by the Committee, noting the benefits of doing so. He suggested that the cost of placing a stop at King and Victoria Streets be determined and that the stop be implemented for the iXpress by September 2011, as well as suggesting that the Committee ascertain the cost of operating Route 7 service with buses every ten minutes. He related the group’s support for fare increases of 25 cents every two years for cash fares and similar increases for other fares, and suggested that existing transit affordability programs be expanded if fares are not to be raised for those who will have difficulty affording an increase.

ADJOURN

MOVED by L. Armstrong
SECONDED by S. Strickland

THAT the meeting adjourn at 8:02 p.m.

CARRIED

COMMITTEE CHAIR, T. Galloway

COMMITTEE CLERK, M. Grivicic
The following are the minutes of the Regular Council meeting held at 8:10 p.m. in the Regional Council Chamber, 150 Frederick Street, Kitchener, Ontario, with the following members present: Chair K. Seiling, L. Armstrong, J. Brewer, T. Cowan, D. Craig, R. Deutschmann, T. Galloway, J. Haalboom, B. Halloran, R. Kelterborn, G. Lorentz, C. Millar, J. Mitchell*, S. Strickland, and C. Zehr.

Members Absent: J. Wideman

DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST UNDER THE MUNICIPAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT

None declared.

PRESENTATIONS

a) Bob Chodos, past Chair of the Region of Waterloo Arts Fund, presented the Annual Report to Council; a copy of his presentation is appended to the original minutes. He acknowledged the challenges facing Regional Council in setting their budget given the constant and urgent demands of a diverse community. He stated that Regional support of the Arts Fund has enhanced the core mandate of “make art happen” and has resulted in more than $1.25 million of grants to local artists and organizations.

* J. Mitchell joined the meeting at 8:14 p.m.

B. Chodos provided an overview of the granting process and the level of competition for the limited granting dollars available. He advised that in the most recent round of applications, the ratio of the amount allocated to the amount requested was just over 20% and suggested that Regional Council consider increased per capita allocation in a future budget to meet the local demand. He provided examples of successful grant projects and encouraged Council to review the website. He advised that the Board continues to undertake due diligence in ensuring accountability for the dispersed grants through its Final Report review process and he outlined the efforts made during the past year.

In closing, he thanked Regional Council for their continued financial support of what the Arts Fund Board firmly believes to be an exceptional program.

DELEGATIONS

a) Maureen Innes, Waterloo, addressed Council on the issue of Quality of Life on Residents Backing on to the Ira Needles Corridor; a copy of her presentation is appended to the original minutes. Ms. Innes provided an overview of the sense of community that has evolved in her neighbourhood and the quality of life experienced prior to 2006, when development of the Ira Needles corridor began. She described the living conditions during the construction which include increased traffic noise; dust storms; displaced animal life; light pollution and the reduced access to outdoor living. Ms. Innes outlined the efforts made to resolve issues with local municipal officials and the developer.
She stated that the Official Plan in 1990 indicated light arterial development. Chair Seiling sought to clarify the zoning and confirmed that, in fact, the Plan indicated light industrial zoning for that area at the time.

Ms. Innes expressed concern for the quality of life in her neighbourhood in the future as she expects construction to continue for several years. She requested that the Region install noise barriers along the subdivision and restrict lighting in the corridor. In response to her request, Chair Seiling stated that noise barriers do fall under Regional jurisdiction and he inquired if Ms. Innes has met with Regional staff to discuss the current policy for installation. Ms. Innes responded that she and her neighbours are aware of the policy but wish to seek an exemption.

Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services, stated that correspondence, regarding the issue of installation of a noise barrier, was prepared by Regional staff in early December 2010 and that Ms. Innes was advised of the current policy and the proposal of a 50/50 cost shared installation. He stated that the total cost for approximately 430 metres of noise barrier wall would be in the range of $350-430,000.

S. Strickland stated that he will be bringing forward a Notice of Motion to the March 23, 2011 Council meeting to support the Region’s installation and full funding of a noise barrier. He cited other local subdivisions where the noise barriers have been installed and paid for by developers. He requested that staff take into consideration the extenuating circumstances of Ms. Innes’ neighbourhood location. Chair Seiling stated that Council requires a full report on this matter before considering an exemption, per Regional procedures. T. Schmidt confirmed that staff will prepare a report which will include other sites with similar conditions and the impact of an exemption.

J. Mitchell requested a copy of the staff correspondence; this will be distributed to all Councillors prior to the next Council meeting. B. Halloran indicated that staff at the City of Waterloo has been assisting the neighbourhood community in arranging meetings with Regional staff and that she is disappointed with the results of the Region’s response. Council requested that the staff report respond to the following issues: the identification of another location within the Region where identical development circumstances exist and whether the City of Waterloo is willing to assist in offsetting some of the residents’ expenses in the cost-sharing proposal.

In response to a Council inquiry about the registration and construction of the commercial development, Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Housing and Community Services, stated that the construction began last year and that all approvals were finalized in 2010. He advised that the zoning is a combination of commercial and light industrial but predominantly light industrial. Council briefly discussed the pre-existing zoning and the subsequent amendments to the zoning.

In response to a Council question about the responsibility of the developer to install noise barriers along the properties that back onto Ira Needles Boulevard, R. Horne stated that the pre-existing and current noise levels are the basis for the application of the Regional policy and that this issue is addressed in the correspondence to Ms. Innes.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

MOVED by G. Lorentz
SECONDED by J. Brewer
THAT the following Minutes be approved:

a) Budget – February 2, 2011  
b) Budget Public Input – February 2, 2011  
c) Council – February 2, 2011  
d) Closed Committee – February 15, 2011  
e) Planning & Works – February 15, 2011  
f) Administration & Finance – February 15, 2011  
g) Community Services – February 15, 2011  
h) Library – February 15, 2011  

CARRIED

MOVED by J. Haalboom  
SECONDED by L. Armstrong

THAT Council go into Committee of the Whole to consider reports.

CARRIED

FINANCE REPORTS


MOVED by R. Kelterborn  
SECONDED by B. Halloran

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo accept the proposal of Barber-Collins Security Services Ltd. for P2010-54 Security Services Region of Waterloo, Regional Buildings and Properties, Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo for a three (3) year term commencing March 1, 2011 at a total price of $4,021,758.39 including all applicable taxes;

AND THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo grant pre-budget approval to cover the 2011 expenditures for this tender.

CARRIED

b) F-11-012, Water Services SCADA Software Procurement

MOVED by R. Kelterborn  
SECONDED by B. Halloran

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo accept the proposal of GE Intelligent Platforms Canada c/o Gray Matter Systems Canada Inc., for the supply of SCADA software to an upset amount of $269,019.10 including all applicable taxes.

CARRIED
COMMITTEE REPORTS

Planning and Works

Councillor Haalboom requested that item 5 be taken separately.

The Summary of Recommendations of the Planning and Works Committee was presented by Geoff Lorentz, Vice Chair of the Committee.

MOVED by G. Lorentz
SECONDED by R. Kelterborn

THAT the Summary of Recommendations of the Planning and Works Committee, dated February 15, 2011, Items 1 to 4; 6 to 12, and 2 reports from closed session, Items 13 and 14, be adopted as follows:

1. THAT Report E-11-020 Fountain Street - King Street Improvements, Shantz Hill Road to Eagle Street, City of Cambridge Class Environmental Assessment, Recommended Design Concept be referred to the project team and staff for further consideration.

2. THAT Report E-10-088, South Boundary Corridor and Franklin Boulevard Extension Class Environmental Assessment, City of Cambridge and Township of North Dumfries - Recommended Design Alternative be referred back to staff.


4. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the following actions, as described in Report P-11-013, dated February 15, 2011 with respect to the new Regional Official Plan:

   a) Ratify the Notice of Appeal dated January 21, 2011 filed by the Regional Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services at the direction of Regional Council with respect to the Notice of Decision of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing dated December 22, 2010;

   b) Request the Ontario Municipal Board to move immediately toward a pre-hearing to identify the parties and participants of the hearing, and clarify and/or reduce the number of issues under appeal; and

   c) Authorize Regional staff to participate and take any necessary steps in the Ontario Municipal Board process, including the negotiation and resolution of appeals, and direct the Regional Solicitor to retain such experts and legal counsel, all as deemed necessary and appropriate, by the Regional Solicitor and the Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services to protect the Regional interest in this matter, as expressed by Regional Council through the adoption of the new Regional Official Plan on June 16, 2009 and in subsequent submissions to the Province.

6. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo grant pre-budget approval in the amount of $21,965 million prior to finalization of the 2011 Regional budget in March 2011, to allow the tendering and contract award of selected 2011 capital projects in the first quarter of 2011.[E-11-001]
7. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into a Consulting Services Agreement with AECOM to provide consulting engineering services for the Class Environmental Assessment and Preliminary Design Study for the proposed improvements to Ottawa Street between King Street and Mill Street in the City of Kitchener for an upset limit fee of $402,612.00 plus applicable taxes. [E-11-018]

AND THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo grant pre-budget approval, for this phase of the project, prior to approval of the 2011 Ten Year Transportation Capital Program.

8. That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo accept the proposal of HSI Inc. for the supply of two (2) high speed turbo blowers for the Kitchener Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) Plant 1 in the amount of $508,367.79 including applicable taxes. [E-11-022]

9. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into an agreement with Grand River Conservation Authority and Rockway Holdings Ltd. to provide for installation of sanitary and storm sewer services under the Fairway Road Extension for future potential servicing of lands owned by Rockway Holdings Ltd. and Grand River Conservation Authority, and a storm sewer channel across lands owned by Grand River Conservation Authority to service the Fairway Road Extension, as described in Report No. CR-RS-11-009, subject to such agreement being satisfactory to the Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services and the Regional Solicitor.


11. That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo extend AECOM’s consulting assignment for the Pre-Design of the Kitchener Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrades (Planning & Works Report E-10-071 of June 22, 2010) to include engineering services for the detailed design and services during construction for Plant 1 Upgrades at an additional upset fee limit of $330,000.00 plus applicable taxes at a grand total of $2,428,275 plus applicable taxes. [E-11-017]

12. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into a Consulting Services Agreement with AECOM Canada Ltd. of Kitchener, Ontario, to provide consulting engineering services for undertaking the West Montrose Water Supply System Class Environmental Assessment (EA) preliminary design and disinfection upgrades, at an upset limit of $478,215 plus applicable taxes, as per Report E-11-019, dated February 15, 2011.

AND THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo grant pre-budget approval, for this phase of the project, prior to approval of the 2011 Ten Year Water Capital Program.

13. THAT the Region of Waterloo appoint Bruce Bieth to the Laurel Creek Headwaters Environmentally Sensitive Landscape Public Liaison Committee for a one-year term expiring December 31, 2011.

14. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve, enter into Agreements for, and execute all documentation related to, the acquisition of lands for improvements to Trussler Road described as Part Lot 2, Block A, Concession 3, being Parts 5, 6 and 7, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, in the Township of Wilmot, Regional Municipality of Waterloo from Glenn Rodney Sider and Susan Diane Sider for the sum of $6,000.00, plus associated costs to the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor.
CARRIED

MOVED by G. Lorentz
SECONDED by R. Kelterborn

THAT the Summary of Recommendations of the Planning and Works Committee, dated February 15, 2011, Item 5, be adopted as follows:

5. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve an amendment to Controlled Access By-law #58-87 to close a right-in, right-out, left-in only access on the east side of Regional Road #28 (Homer Watson Boulevard) approximately 257 metres south of Block Line Road and a right-in, right-out only access on the east side of Regional Road #28 (Homer Watson Boulevard) to the commercial block south of Block Line Road in the City of Kitchener;

AND THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve an amendment to Controlled Access By-law #58-87 for a right-in, right-out, left-in only access on the east side of Regional Road #28 (Homer Watson Boulevard) approximately 251 metres south of Block Line Road and a right-in, right-out only access on the east side of Homer Watson Boulevard approximately 145 metres south of Block Line Road in the City of Kitchener with both accesses being subject to approval of a site plan by the City of Kitchener as described in P-11-014, dated February 15, 2011.

CARRIED, J. Haalboom opposed

Administration and Finance

The Summary of Recommendations of the Administration and Finance Committee was presented by Tom Galloway, Chair of the Committee.

MOVED by T. Galloway
SECONDED by B. Halloran

THAT the Summary of Recommendations of the Administration and Finance Committee dated February 15, 2011, Items 1 to 3, be adopted as follows:

1. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo adopt the 2011 Accessibility Plan;

AND THAT the 2011 Accessibility Plan be sent to the Ministry of Community and Social Services for information as outlined in Report CR-CLK-11-002.

2. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo appoint Tim Beckett, City of Kitchener Fire Chief, as Regional Fire Coordinator, and Lyle Quan, City of Waterloo, General Manager of Protective Services/Fire Chief as Deputy Regional Fire Coordinator effective January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011, as outlined in Report CA-EM-11-001 dated February 15, 2011.

3. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve proceeding with the Construction Tender for the Waterloo Regional Police Services New North Division as described in Report CR-FM-11-03, dated February 15, 2011.

CARRIED
Community Services

The Summary of Recommendation of the Community Services Committee was presented by Sean Strickland, Chair of the Committee.

MOVED by S. Strickland
SECONDED by R. Kelterborn

THAT the Summary of Recommendation of the Community Services Committee dated February 15, 2011, Item 1, be adopted as follows:


CARRIED

Library

The Summary of Recommendations of the Library Committee was presented by Todd Cowan, Chair of the Committee.

MOVED by T. Cowan
SECONDED by R. Kelterborn

THAT the Summary of Recommendations of the Library Committee dated February 15, 2011, Items 1 to 2, be adopted as follows:

1. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to Report P-LIB-11-001, dated February 15, 2011:

   a) Appoint Todd Cowan to the Southern Ontario Library Service Trustee Council as a representative of the Region of Waterloo Library; and
   b) Authorize the Library Chair to make submissions to senior government levels in response to time-sensitive initiatives.

2. THAT the Library Committee approve the submission of correspondence to L. Pendergast, M.P.P. (Kitchener-Conestoga) seeking support for increased funding for provincial operating grants to public libraries.

CARRIED

Budget

The Summary of Recommendations of the Budget Committee was presented by Tom Galloway, Chair of the Committee. Councillor Strickland requested that each item be taken separately.

MOVED by T. Galloway
SECONDED by R. Kelterborn

1. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve for Water Supply, the 2011 Operating Budget, the 2011 Capital Budget and the 2012-2020 Capital Forecast.
THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve a Regional Water Rate of $0.7775 per cubic metre effective March 1, 2011 and that the necessary by-law be introduced.

CARRIED

MOVED by T. Galloway
SECONDED by R. Kelterborn

2. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve for Wastewater Treatment, the 2011 Operating Budget, the 2011 Capital Budget and the 2012-2020 Capital Forecast.

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve a Regional Wastewater Rate of $0.6965 per cubic metre effective March 1, 2011 and that the necessary by-law be introduced.

CARRIED

MOVED by T. Galloway
SECONDED by R. Kelterborn

3. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the 2011 Operating Budget, the 2011 Capital Budget and the 2012-2020 Capital Forecast for the Retail Water Distribution System.

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve a Retail Water Rate of $1.52 per cubic metre effective March 1, 2011 and that the necessary by-law be introduced.

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve a monthly maintenance fee of $5.00 per account for the customers of the Retail Water Distribution System effective March 1, 2011 and that the necessary by-law be introduced.

CARRIED

MOVED by T. Galloway
SECONDED by R. Kelterborn

4. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the 2011 Operating Budget, the 2011 Capital Budget and the 2012-2020 Capital Forecast for the Retail Wastewater Collection System.

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve a Retail Wastewater Rate of $1.35 per cubic metre effective March 1, 2011 and that the necessary by-law be introduced.

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve a monthly maintenance fee of $4.00 per account for the customers of the Retail Wastewater Collection System effective March 1, 2011 and that the necessary by-law be introduced.

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve an increase of 7.9% to the flat annual rate that is currently being charged per residential connection and per commercial/industrial connection for the users of the Wastewater Collection System that do not have a water meter installed effective March 1, 2011 and that the necessary by-law be introduced.

CARRIED
OTHER MATTERS UNDER COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MOVED by G. Lorentz
SECONDED by C. Millar

THAT Committee of the Whole rise and Council resume.

CARRIED

MOVED by J. Brewer
SECONDED by C. Zehr

THAT Council adopt the proceeding of the Committee of the Whole.

CARRIED

OTHER BUSINESS

a) Intersection of Westforest Trail and Victoria Street

C. Zehr expressed his concern with the lack of traffic lights at the intersection of Westforest Trail and Victoria Street, specifically the potential risk to children crossing. He requested that staff review this intersection and bring a report back to the Planning and Works Committee.

b) Parking for Patrons of Registry Theatre

J. Haalboom asked that staff consider the arrangement of access to the parking garage for patrons of the Registry Theatre during evening performances. Chair Seiling stated that the matter falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Kitchener as they operate the garage.

c) Petition Regarding the Ira Needles Boulevard roundabout

J. Mitchell requested that a copy of the petition received from residents living near the Ira Needles Boulevard and Erb Street roundabout be shared with Councillors and that a staff report be prepared to review the issues raised about pedestrian safety. Chair Seiling advised that the petition has been forwarded to the Transportation and Environmental Services department. T. Schmidt stated that staff have contacted the petitioners.

d) Water Treatment Technology Conference

In response to J. Brewer’s request for a presentation about the staff trip and conference presentation on the water treatment technology that is being implemented by Regional staff, T. Schmidt advised that arrangements can be made for a future presentation to Council.

ENACTMENT OF BY-LAWS – (FIRST, SECOND & THIRD READINGS)

MOVED by B. Halloran
SECONDED by R. Kelterborn

a) THAT a By-law to Amend By-law Number 58-87, as amended, Being a By-law to Designate and Regulate Controlled Access Roads (Homer Watson Boulevard, City of Kitchener) be read a first, second and third time, finally passed and numbered 11-008
signed by the Regional Chair and Regional Clerk and sealed with the Regional Seal.

b) THAT A By-law to Provide for the Appointment of a Regional Fire Coordinator and a Deputy Regional Fire Coordinator and to Repeal By-law 10-007 be read a first, second and third time, finally passed and numbered 11-009 signed by the Regional Chair and Regional Clerk and sealed with the Regional Seal.

c) THAT A By-law to Amend the Wholesale Rates By-law 33-90 and to Repeal By-Law 09-057 be read a first, second and third time, finally passed and numbered 11-010 signed by the Regional Chair and Regional Clerk and sealed with the Regional Seal.

d) THAT A By-law to Impose a Water Service Rate in the Townships of Wellesley and North Dumfries and to Repeal By-law 09-058 be read a first, second and third time, finally passed and numbered 11-011 signed by the Regional Chair and Regional Clerk and sealed with the Regional Seal.

e) THAT A By-law to Impose a Sewage Service Rate in the Townships of Wellesley and North Dumfries and to Repeal By-law 09-059 be read a first, second and third time, finally passed and numbered 11-012 signed by the Regional Chair and Regional Clerk and sealed with the Regional Seal.

f) THAT A By-law to Impose the Regional Sewage Rate and to Repeal By-law 09-060 be read a first, second and third time, finally passed and numbered 11-013 signed by the Regional Chair and Regional Clerk and sealed with the Regional Seal.

g) THAT a By-law to Confirm the Actions of Council of February 23, 2011 be read a first, second and third time, finally passed and numbered 11-014 signed by the Regional Chair and Regional Clerk and sealed with the Regional Seal.

  CARRIED

ADJOURN

MOVED by J. Brewer
SECONDED by T. Cowan

THAT the meeting adjourn at 8:59 p.m.

  CARRIED

REGIONAL CHAIR, K. Seiling

REGIONAL DEPUTY CLERK, L. Wetzel

Members absent: S. Strickland, J. Wideman and C. Zehr

DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST UNDER THE MUNICIPAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT

None declared.

OPENING REMARKS

Vice-Chair G. Lorentz provided opening remarks noting the purpose of the meeting was to provide information and receive input from the public. An overview of the advertisement history of the meeting was provided.

DELEGATIONS

Vice-Chair G. Lorentz made a call for delegations and none were forthcoming.

REPORT –PLANNING, HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

a) P-11-022, Public Meeting for the Greenlands Network Implementation Guideline to the Regional Official Plan

Received for information.

Rob Horne, Commissioner Planning, Housing and Community Services introduced the report. He noted that this is the first implementation guideline released and to have reached the public information stage under the New Regional Official Plan. He also noted that from time to time additional Public Meetings for other types of implementation guidelines will be occurring probably 2 to 3 a year for the next few years.

Chris Gosselin, Manager, Environmental Planning provided a presentation outlining the purpose of an Implementation Guideline, the consultation process to develop the guideline, an overview of the content of the guideline and the process to complete the guideline. A copy of the presentation is appended to the original minutes.

Committee members inquired about when Full Environmental Impact Statements or Scoped Environmental Impact Statements are required. C. Gosselin responded that the “rule of thumb” for over 15 years has been that if an application is contiguous to a designated natural feature,
staff generally scope the terms of reference. If, on the other hand, it is proposed to intrude into the natural feature, staff typically require a Full Environmental Impact Statement. He highlighted that over the years about 98% of the Environmental Impact Statements have been scoped. These more focused studies are preferred by development applicants and agency staff.

**ADJOURN**

MOVED by T. Galloway  
SECONDED by J. Mitchell  

THAT the meeting adjourn at 9:20 a.m.  

CARRIED  

**COMMITTEE VICE-CHAIR, G. Lorentz**  

**COMMITTEE CLERK, E. Flewwelling**
REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO
PLANNING AND WORKS COMMITTEE
MINUTES

Tuesday, March 8, 2011
9:20 a.m.
Region Council Chamber
150 Frederick Street, Kitchener, Ontario

Present were: Vice-Chair G. Lorentz, L. Armstrong, J. Brewer, T. Cowan, D. Craig, R. Deutschmann, T. Galloway, J. Haalboom, B. Halloran, R. Kelterborn, C. Millar, J. Mitchell, and K. Seiling

Members absent: S. Strickland, J. Wideman and C. Zehr

MOTION TO GO INTO CLOSED SESSION

MOVED by R. Kelterborn
SECONDED by L. Armstrong

THAT a closed meeting of the Planning & Works, Administration & Finance and Community Services Committees be held on Tuesday, March 8, 2011 at 8:30 a.m. in the Waterloo County Room in accordance with Section 239 of the Municipal Act, 2001, for the purposes of considering the following subject matters:

a) receiving of advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege in relation to a multi-party legal agreement
b) personal matters about identifiable individuals – committee appointments
c) personal matters about identifiable individuals – committee appointments
d) personal matters about identifiable individuals – committee appointments
e) proposed or pending acquisition of land in the City of Waterloo
f) labour relations related to contract negotiations
g) personal matters about identifiable individuals – committee appointments

CARRIED

MOTION TO RECONVENE IN OPEN SESSION

MOVED by T. Cowan
SECONDED by J. Haalboom

THAT the meeting reconvene into Open Session.

CARRIED

DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST UNDER THE MUNICIPAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT

None declared.
DELEGATIONS/PRESENTATIONS

Rob Horne, Commissioner Planning, Housing and Community Services introduced Cate Huston, Software Engineer with Google Canada to talk about a timely and meaningful partnership staff has engaged in with Google. He also introduced John Cicuttin, Manager Transit Development noting his portion of the presentation will be strictly regarding GRT Advanced Transit Technology.

a) Cate Huston, Google Canada appeared before Committee to provide a demonstration of how Google works with respect to biking, walking, transit and driving directions. She focused the majority of the demonstration on biking directions. C. Huston showed how to obtain various routes and how to change routes on Google. She noted that Google considered all options when obtaining the time it would take for biking directions, for example terrain and fatigue. She briefly highlighted how the bus directions work and how it shows the exact bus number that needs to be taken.

J. Cicuttin provided a presentation on GRT Advanced Transit Technology. He gave a brief overview of where we are now, benefits and use, and future direction. He highlighted the Transit Management System and Traveller Information System. J. Cicuttin introduced and thanked Blair Allen, Supervisor, Transit Development and Neil Malcolm, Senior Transit Engineer for all their work on this project. A copy of the presentation is appended to the original minutes.

Committee members inquired about how to promote and get the word out about Google. Staff noted that in the upcoming Travelwise Newsletter there will be a piece on Google as well when the new website is unveiled. It was also noted that marketing could be discussed in the GRT Business Plan. Committee members suggested that Google approach the Chambers of Commerce.

Some Committee members questioned having a GRT Trip Planner if Google has one. Staff noted that the trip planners are different and that Google receives information from the Region for their Trip Planner. It was also highlighted that the GRT Trip Planner provides more information related to scheduling routes and time.


Committee members asked staff to follow up with MTO to reschedule a time for them to come back to Committee for an update.

c) Ron Gowing, Cadet Youth Development Centre re: Report E-11-032 Region of Waterloo International Airport – Air Cadets Youth Development Centre appeared before Committee. He provided background information on the Air Cadets Youth Development Centre. He highlighted that a team of volunteers helped build and raise funds to build the new building in 2000. He also noted that there is no charge to be part of the programs, there is no government funding and no one gets paid, it is strictly volunteer. He asked that the Region of Waterloo waive fees for the sewer and water connection.

E-11-032, Region of Waterloo International Airport – Air Cadets Youth Development Centre

Committee members noted that by keeping consistent, Council doesn’t waive fees and charges for non-profit organizations but noted that this circumstance is unique because the building is located on Region property and it would eliminate the water and septic tanks.
K. Seiling brought forward a motion that would waive the sewage and water connection fee of $20,000 which would be paid back if the Air Cadets Youth Development Centre proposes to assign the ground lease, sell or sub-lease the building.

MOVED by K. Seiling
SECONDED by T. Galloway

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo waive the sewage and water connection fee of $20,000, as provided in the Region of Waterloo’s fees and charges bylaw, for the connection to the Air Cadets Youth Development Centre at the Region of Waterloo International Airport as noted in report E-11-032 dated March 8, 2011,

AND THAT if at any time in the future the Air Cadets Youth Development Centre proposes to assign the ground lease, sell or sub-lease the building the Regional Municipality of Waterloo would require the $20,000 connection fee be paid prior to the Region of Waterloo approving of the assignment, sale or sub-lease. Alternatively, should the building be used for any purpose other than the non-profit delivery of youth programs consistent with the mandate of the Royal Canadian Air Cadets, the connection fee shall be become payable.

AND THAT the Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services be authorized to enter into an agreement with the 822 (Tutor) Squadron – Royal Canadian Air Cadets with respect to the waiver of connection fees and provision of water and sanitary service to the Air Cadet facility with such agreement to be to the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor.

CARRIED

REPORTS – TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION

a) E-11-023, Bridge Street Improvements, Bridgeport Bridge to the Kitchener/Woolwich Boundary, City of Kitchener

Some Committee members addressed concerns with the lack of landscaping mentioned in the report and inquired about the trail connection. Bill Brodribb, Director, Design and Construction noted that a landscape architect will be hired to look at all projects requiring landscaping and highlighted that looking at the trail connection will happen during the design phase.

Naim Khan the property owner of 22 Bridge Street appeared before Committee addressing his concerns with the Bridge Street Improvements. He briefly described the history of the property and how the proposed modifications would affect his property. He highlighted that his main concern was snow removal in front of his property once the sidewalk is installed because of the existing porch and the location and size of the sidewalk.

Committee members inquired about the year Mr. Khan purchased the house and when the porch was built. Samer Inchasi, Senior Project Manager indicated that Mr. Khan purchased the house July 31, 2008 and noted that the porch was already built by the pervious owner.

Committee members discussed in great detail installing sidewalks, not installing sidewalks, the size of the sidewalks, and snow removal on the sidewalks in that area.
Committee members directed staff to look at installing 1.5 meter sidewalks in that area and to have further discussions with the owner of the property and the City of Kitchener regarding the front porch.

MOVED by T. Galloway
SECONDED by R. Kelterborn

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to proposed improvements on Bridge Street (Regional Road No. 52) from the Bridgeport Bridge to the Kitchener/Woolwich Boundary in the City of Kitchener:

a) approve the proposed improvements for Bridge Street as outlined in Report E-11-023; and

b) amend Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as amended, to provide Reserved Lanes for bicycles on both sides of Bridge Street from the Bridgeport Bridge to the Kitchener/Woolwich Boundary.

CARRIED

b) CR-RS-11-012, Authorization to Expropriate Lands (2nd Report) for Road Improvements to Trussler Road (Regional Road 70), in the City of Kitchener and Township of Wilmot

MOVED by L. Armstrong
SECONDED by C. Millar

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the expropriation of the lands for the purposes of construction of road improvements to Trussler Road, in the City of Kitchener and the Township of Wilmot, in the Region of Waterloo as detailed in Report CR-RS-11-012 dated March 8, 2011 described as follows:

Fee Simple Partial Taking:

a. Part Lot 1, Concession 1, Block ‘A’, Township of Wilmot, being Part 1, on Reference Plan 58R-16917, PIN 22186-0234(LT) (1040 Huron Road)

b. Part Lot 1, Concession 1, Block ‘A’, Township of Wilmot, being Part 2, on Reference Plan 58R-16917, PIN 22186-0233(LT) (1465 Trussler Road)

c. Part Lot 1, Concession 1, Block ‘A’, Township of Wilmot, being Part 3, on Reference Plan 58R-16917, PIN 22186-0232(LT) (1359 Trussler Road)

d. Part Lot 136, German Company Tract, City of Kitchener, being Part 5, on Reference Plan 58R-16917, PIN 22728-0010(LT) (1434 Trussler Road)

e. Part Lot 135, German Company Tract, City of Kitchener, being Part 6, on Reference Plan 58R-16917, PIN 22728-0009(LT) (no municipal address)

f. Part Lot 1, Concession South of Bleam’s Road, Township of Wilmot, being Part 7, on Reference Plan 58R-16917, PIN 22186-0211(LT) (1259 Trussler Road)

g. Part Lot 1, Concession South of Bleam’s Road, Township of Wilmot, being Part 8, on Reference Plan 58R-16917, PIN 22186-0210(LT) (1177 Trussler Road)
h. Part Lots 129, 133 & 134, German Company Tract, City of Kitchener, being Part 9, on Reference Plan 58R-16917, PIN 22728-0005(LT) (no municipal address)

i. Part Lot 1, Concession South of Blem’s Road, Township of Wilmot, being Part 10, on Reference Plan 58R-16917, PIN 22186-0205(LT) (no municipal address)

j. Part Lot 129, German Company Tract, City of Kitchener, being Part 11, on Reference Plan 58R-16917, PIN 22727-0022(LT) (808 Trussler Road)

k. Part Lot 2, Concession 3, Block ‘A’, Township of Wilmot, being Part 1, on Reference Plan 58R-16917, PIN 22723-0015(LT) (2483 Trussler Road)

l. Part Lot 13, Beasley’s New Survey, City of Kitchener, being Part 2, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, PIN 22207-0377(LT) (2878 New Dundee Road)

m. Part Lot 2, Concession 3, Block ‘A’, Township of Wilmot, being Parts 5, 6 and 7, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, PIN 22207-0376(LT) (2113 Trussler Road)

n. Part Lot 2, Concession 2, Block ‘A’, Township of Wilmot, being Part 8, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, PIN 22207-0028(LT) (no municipal address)

o. Part Lot 13, Beasley’s New Survey, City of Kitchener, being Part 9, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, PIN 22723-0036(LT) (no municipal address)

p. Part Lot 13, Beasley’s New Survey, City of Kitchener, being Part 10, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, PIN 22207-0008(LT) (no municipal address)

q. Part Lot 149, German Company Tract, City of Kitchener, being Part 11, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, PIN 22723-0007(LT) (1738 Trussler Road)

r. Part Lot 15, South side of Huron Road, Plan 585 and Part Lot 149, German Company Tract, City of Kitchener, being Part 12, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, PIN 22723-0006(LT) (no municipal address)

s. Part Lot 1, Concession 2, Block ‘A’, Township of Wilmot, being Parts 13 and 14, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, PIN 22207-0025(LT) (1743 Trussler Road)

t. Part Lot 1, South side of Huron Road, Plan 585, City of Kitchener, being Part 15, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, PIN 22723-0004(LT) (1698 Trussler Road)

AND THAT staff be instructed to register a Plan of Expropriation for the property within three months of the granting of the approval to expropriate the property, as required by the Expropriations Act;

AND THAT the registered owners be served with a Notice of Expropriation and a Notice of Possession for the property after the registration of the Plan of Expropriation;

AND THAT if no agreement as to compensation is made with an owner, the statutory Offer of Compensation and payment be served upon the registered owners of the property in the amount of the market value of the interests in the land as estimated by the Region’s appraiser in accordance with the Expropriations Act;
AND FURTHER THAT the Regional Solicitor be authorized to discontinue expropriation proceedings or any part thereof, in respect of the above described lands, or any part thereof, upon the registration on title of the required documentation to complete the transaction.

CARRIED

TRANSPORTATION

c) Long Term Roads Funding

*Deferred from Budget February 23rd, 2011*

John Hammer, Director, Transportation appeared Committee and made a presentation on Transportation Capital Base Program. He outlined the background, recent accomplishments, Long Term Funding Strategy and Upcoming Projects Planned. A copy of the presentation is appended to the original minutes.

d) CR-RS-11-014/E-11-026, Region of Waterloo International Airport – Declaration of Surplus and Lease with IP Aviation L.P.

MOVED by K. Seiling
SECONDED by T. Cowan

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo declare a leasehold interest of greater than twenty-one (21) years in the Lands described as part of Lot 111, German Company Tract of the Geographic Township of Woolwich, Regional Municipality of Waterloo, being parts 1 and 2 on the draft Reference Plan of Survey attached to Report CR-RS-11-014/E-11-026 dated March 8, 2011 as Appendix A and forming part of Property Identifier 22254-0193 (LT) (the Lands), surplus to its needs, in accordance with the Region’s Property Disposition By-law;

AND THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo authorize the Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services to enter into a Lease with IP Aviation L.P., by its general partner, IP Aviation GP Inc., (the Lessee) as described in Report CR-RS-11-014/E-11-026 dated March 8, 2011 with the form of the lease to be to the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor.

CARRIED

e) CR-RS-11-016/E-11-037, Region of Waterloo International Airport – Declaration of Surplus and Lease with Waterloo Aviation Corp.

MOVED by K. Seiling
SECONDED by R. Kelterborn

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo declare a leasehold interest of greater than twenty-one (21) years in the Lands forming part of Lot 111, German Company Tract of the Geographic Township of Woolwich, Regional Municipality of Waterloo, being lots 10 and 11 on the plan attached to Report CR-RS-11-016/E-11-037 dated March 8, 2011 as Appendix A (the Lands), surplus to its needs, in accordance with the Region’s Property Disposition By-law;

AND THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo authorize the Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services to enter into a Lease with Waterloo Aviation Corp. (the Lessee) as described in Report CR-RS-11-016/E-11-037 dated March 8, 2011 with the form of the lease to be to the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor.
CARRIED

f) E-11-031, Air Show August 20 and August 21, 2011 at Region of Waterloo International Airport

Received for information.

WATER

g) E-11-015, 2010 Summary Report for Regional Municipality of Waterloo Integrated Urban and Rural Water Systems

Received for information.

h) E-11-030, Promotion of Tap Water Update

Received for information.

i) Waterloo North Water Supply – Class Environmental Assessment - Information Package in Advance of PIC

Received for information.

REPORTS – PLANNING, HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

COMMUNITY PLANNING

j) P-11-023, Third Annual Report of the Laurel Creek Headwaters Environmentally Sensitive Landscape Public Liaison Committee

Received for information.

COMMUNITY SERVICES

k) P-11-024, Year End 2010 Population and Household Estimates for the Region of Waterloo

R. Horne announced that the official population up to the end of last year was 543,700. He noted that it was another strong growth year and that these figures are used widely by the Area Municipalities and other agencies for a number of applications.

Committee members inquired if there is a breakout of senior citizen homes. Staff noted that in terms of current populations it is based on permits issued and census information and that senior homes are probably classified as collective dwellings and haven’t specifically been split out.

MOVED by B. Halloran
SECONDED by J. Mitchell


CARRIED
I) P-11-025, 2010 Building Permit Activity and Growth Monitoring

R. Horne introduced the report and noted that 2010 was a strong year and currently for 2011 the development activity remains strong in terms of development preparedness. R. Horne also noted that the Provincial Growth Plan requires the Region to plan for a minimum of 40% of residential development be constructed within the built up area, in 2010 the Region exceeded that 40% and achieved 56%.

In response to a Committee inquiry on conversion of old buildings and the benefits that come out of that. R. Horne responded that next year they certainly can capture the conversions and characterize the bigger developments and the benefits that might bring.

Received for information.

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

m) P-11-026, Grand River Transit Service Planning Public Consultation Centres

R. Horne provided introductory comments.

In response to a Committee inquiry regarding only approving half the amount of buses and bus drivers, how would services be impacted. Graham Vincent, Director, Transportation Planning noted that a priority list could be prepared prior to March 23 noting the impacts.

Received for information.

n) P-11-027, Grand River Transit Service to Elmira – Proposed Extension of Pilot Service

R. Horne introduced the report and noted that the pilot is doing well and that some refinements were made. Staff is recommending extending the pilot until the end of December 2011 to do some additional marketing and because Grand River Transit Business Plan is being implemented this year and the rural transit strategy will be a focal part of that. He also highlighted that Woolwich Township has requested further discussion regarding expanding transit service into Breslau.

MOVED by T. Cowan
SECONDED by J. Mitchell

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo extend the Route 21 – Elmira Grand River Transit pilot service to December 31, 2011, as described in Report P-11-027, dated March 8, 2011 and that funding be provided from the Corporate Capital Levy Reserve Fund.

CARRIED

o) P-11-028, Highway 7 & 8 (Stratford – New Hamburg) Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study: Preliminary Planning and Access Management

R. Horne provided introductory comments.

Received for information.
INFORMATION/CORRESPONDENCE

a) Correspondence from Naim Khan re: Bridge Street Improvements
   Memo from Staff in Response to Correspondence from Naim Khan was received for information.

OTHER BUSINESS

a) Council Enquiries and Requests for Information Tracking List was received for information.

NEXT MEETING – April 12, 2011

ADJOURN

MOVED by T. Galloway
SECONDED by J. Brewer

THAT the meeting adjourn at 11:25 a.m.

CARRIED

COMMITTEE VICE-CHAIR, G. Lorentz

COMMITTEE CLERK, E. Flewwelling

Members absent: S. Strickland, J. Wideman, C. Zehr

DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST UNDER THE MUNICIPAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT

None declared.

PRESENTATIONS

a) Jennifer McConkey, Municipal Property Assessment Corporation re: MPAC update

J. McConkey introduced her colleague Jon Hebden, Municipal Relations Representative, Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC).

*L. Armstrong entered the meeting at 11:34 a.m.

J. McConkey provided a presentation to the Committee regarding:

- History of assessment growth, inflation and municipal funding;
- Number of properties and cost per assessment, with drivers of costs;
- MPAC board-approved budget increase, and overview of budget pressures;
- Explanation of MPAC funding formula;
- Information sharing and partnership with municipalities in MPAC activities;
- Building permits received vs. completed, 2008-10;
- Property count vs. outstanding building permits; and
- New technology and initiatives to improve efficiency and timeliness of assessments.

A copy of the presentation is attached to the original minutes.

The Committee obtained clarification from J. McConkey that the MPAC funding formula yields an above-average increase to assessment costs for the Region.

The Committee learned that the MPAC budget for staff saw no increase in 2010-11, but that increased operating expenses are provided for in the budgeted increase to assessment costs.

The Committee ascertained from J. McConkey that MPAC investigates any property where a building permit was issued, or aim to inspect every property on a 12 year cycle if no other action triggers a reassessment. She elaborated on the process used to assess the value of properties, as well as the technology to be introduced to assist assessors in their work.
The Committee observed that two identical cities which differed only in their property values would differ in the fees owing to MPAC for assessing the exact same properties. J. McConkey affirmed that the MPAC funding formula would yield this outcome. The Committee discussed the funding formula, with observations that it could be considered a veiled form of equalization for municipalities in the province. Larry Ryan, Chief Financial Officer, related his past experience on the MPAC board with respect to allocation of assessment costs across municipalities, noting that perhaps 6-7 municipalities in the Greater Toronto Area were observed to be subsidizing approximately 200 others. He affirmed that the Region at that time was fairly close to the breakeven point in that regard.

The Committee raised the issue of supplementary taxes and the perceived large size of these taxes, and asked when the size of supplementary tax revenues might be expected to be reduced. J. McConkey indicated that as new initiatives and technologies are implemented, MPAC will be able to better plan its assessment activity and allocate resources accordingly, which could bring about lower supplementary taxes from greater timeliness of assessments. The Committee discussed the backlog of building permits and communication of occupancy related to permits, which is a frequent item on the agenda at the Area Treasurers’ meetings.

*D. Craig left the meeting at 12:01 p.m.

J. McConkey related to the Committee that notification of new building permits are received on a monthly basis by MPAC, from most municipalities in electronic form but from some municipalities in hard copy form. MPAC is championing electronic permit reporting and a move to a standardized template for permits, as well as working to obtain information on occupancies on a monthly basis.

REPORTS – Chief Administrative Officer

a) CA-11-002.1, 2010 Internal Audit Report

Received for Information.

Mike Murray, Chief Administrative Officer, introduced David A. Young, Manager, Internal Audit, and provided a short overview of the report.

b) CA-11-003, Citizen Input and Engagement in the 2011-2014 Strategic Planning Process

Received for Information.

M. Murray provided an overview of the report, noting that Council has seen the content of the report as part of its strategic planning sessions and that staff will continue to use the input obtained for a variety of purposes and strategies in the strategic planning process.

REPORTS – Finance

c) F-11-013, Grant Application to Fund Regional Development Charges - Habitat for Humanity

The Committee ascertained from L. Ryan that this grant application arises from the fact that development charge revenues cannot pay for grants to fund development charges. The
Committee confirmed that this grant needs to be made in each Council term. Debra Arnold, Director, Legal Services/Regional Solicitor described the onerous process to include such an exception in the Development Charges by-law and affirmed the method undertaken through the report as more expedient. The Committee confirmed that the recommendation, if passed, would fund the grant for the term of Council.

MOVED by K. Seiling  
SECONDED by J. Brewer

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo establish a policy for the term of Council that a grant be provided to cover the cost of Regional Development Charges for housing built as a Habitat for Humanity project, with the cost of the grant to be provided from the Housing Reserve Fund, as described in Report F-11-013, dated March 8, 2011.

CARRIED

REPORTS – Corporate Resources

d) CR-FM-11-005, Allocation of 2010 Corporate Sustainability Fund

Received for Information.

e) CR-FM-11-006, Update on FCM Partners for Climate Protection Program

Received for Information.

f) CR-RS-11-015, Surplus Declaration and Conveyance Adjacent to Columbia Street, City of Waterloo to the Corporation of the City of Waterloo

MOVED by C. Millar  
SECONDED by B. Halloran

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo:

a) Declare the lands described as Part Lot 1, Municipal Compiled Plan of Subdivision of Lot 6, German Company Tract, being Part 1, Reference Plan 58R-16677, in the City of Waterloo surplus to the needs of the Region, as detailed in Report No. CR-RS-11-015 dated March 8, 2011, and provide the standard public notification as required by the Region’s property disposition by-law; and

b) Approve and execute all documentation related to the conveyance of the lands described as Part 1, Reference Plan 58R-16677, at the cost of the Region, to the Corporation of the City of Waterloo for road widening purposes, for the sum of $1.00, as detailed in Report No. CR-RS-11-015 dated March 8, 2011, pursuant to the Region’s property disposition by-law and the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor.

CARRIED

REPORT OF THE AUDIT COMMITTEE

a) Minutes of the Audit Committee – February 14, 2011
MOVED by L. Armstrong
SECONDED by J. Brewer

THAT the Administration and Finance Committee approve the minutes of the Audit Committee dated February 14, 2011.

CARRIED

OTHER BUSINESS

a) Council Enquiries and Requests for Information Tracking Sheet was received for information.

NEXT MEETING – April 12, 2011

ADJOURN

MOVED by J. Haalboom
SECONDED by G. Lorentz

THAT the meeting adjourn at 12:14 p.m.

CARRIED

COMMITTEE CHAIR, T. Galloway

COMMITTEE CLERK, M. Grivicic
Present were: Vice Chair J. Mitchell, L. Armstrong, J. Brewer, T. Cowan, R. Deutschmann, T. Galloway, J. Haalboom, B. Halloran*, R. Kelterborn*, G. Lorentz, C. Millar and K. Seiling

Members absent: D. Craig, S. Strickland, J. Wideman and C. Zehr

DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST UNDER THE MUNICIPAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT

None declared

PRESENTATIONS

a) Linda Terry and Laura VanderGriendt, Social Planning Council of Cambridge and North Dumfries, presented their Annual Community Trends Package 2010 to the Committee; a copy of their presentation is appended to the original minutes. Copies of the package were distributed to Councillors.

L. Terry provided an introduction to the organization and its areas of focus. She stated that the annual report serves to track local trends, as drawn from the most recent Statistics Canada data, and informs local social service agencies, program planners, the business community, policy makers and funders.

L. VanderGriendt provided an overview of the comprehensive report and the Executive Summary, which highlights the key findings using broad demographic indicators. She extended appreciation to the local organizations which provided data for this report. She summarized the community profile for Cambridge, which included information about trends related to population family composition, immigration, language, employment and poverty. She provided highlights of the North Dumfries profile which included trend information for population demographics, income levels and the food security.

* B. Halloran joined the meeting at 1:07 p.m.

L. VanderGriendt provided an overview of Sign Posts 2010, stating that affordable housing, food security and income security, especially for seniors, continues to be a challenge in the community of Cambridge. She stated that the Seniors Profile indicates a diverse and growing population where seniors are working longer and predominantly in a part-time capacity.

* R. Kelterborn joined the meeting at 1:12 p.m.

L. Terry stated that the Social Planning Council will continue to track local trends but she expressed her concern with the replacement of the Census long form since the same caliber of information won’t be available. She reviewed the listing of offered publications, highlighted the organization’s involvement with local planning groups and committees, identified the services
offered through the Community Information Centre and thanked the Region and other funders for their continued support.

b) Planning, Housing and Community Services – Overview of Major Issues and Priorities related to Community Services and Housing

Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Housing and Community Services, gave a presentation to the Committee; a copy is appended to original minutes. He provided information about past year and forecasted attendance at the Region’s cultural facilities, indicating an enhanced marketing partnership with external groups. He gave an overview of the activities at the Regionally-operated rural libraries including e-usage, family literacy and accessibility. He summarized data for housing units owned and managed by the Region, the funding sources for retrofits and redevelopment, the Community Action Plan for Housing, the Provincial Long Term Housing Strategy and the Region’s encouragement of private sector participation.

R. Horne responded to Committee questions regarding generational cycles of housing applicants, and housing for new immigrants and the working poor. He stated that the Region is seeking solutions through the Homelessness Partnering Strategy.

REPORTS – Planning, Housing and Community Services

a) P-11-031, Proposed ‘Place of Employment’ Survey

MOVED by T. Galloway
SECONDED by B. Halloran

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo receive Report P-11-031, Proposed ‘Place of Employment’ Survey, dated March 8, 2011 for information;

AND THAT this report be distributed to interested parties, including the Area Municipalities and the Canada’s Technology Triangle (CTT), to advise of the initiation of this project, and to request their support in raising awareness.

CARRIED

b) P-11-032, Raising Awareness of the 2011 Census

MOVED by L. Armstrong
SECONDED by J. Haalboom

THAT The Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions to raise awareness of the 2011 Census as described in P-11-032, dated March 8, 2011:

a) Encourage all residents of the Region of Waterloo to provide a complete response to the 2011 Census Form during May, 2011; and

b) Use available channels, such as the Region of Waterloo website, to direct residents to information about the Census.

CARRIED
INTERDEPARTMENTAL REPORTS

a) PH-11-012/P-11-030, 2010 ECOFest Overview and Planning for 2011

Dave Young, Manager, Health Protection and Investigation, highlighted the attendance figures for the 2010 event, acknowledged event partners and stated that planning is underway for the 2011 event.

In response to a Committee question about collaboration with area municipalities, Mike Murray, Chief Administrative Officer stated that the Region collaborates on an ongoing basis, meeting with environmental planning counterparts to determine opportunities for joint events. Dr. Liana Nolan, Commissioner/Medical Officer of Health, advised that the event will continue to evolve and staff will make every effort to work with area municipalities.

Received for information.

b) SS-11-013/CA-11-004, Waterloo Region Immigration Partnership

Michael Schuster, Commissioner, Social Services, introduced the report, stating that this is a follow-up to the planning phase. He advised that the program is fully funded by the federal government.

MOVED by T. Galloway
SECONDED by T. Cowan

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo continue to serve as host for the Waterloo Region Immigration Partnership Council and, in its capacity as such, enter into agreements with the Federal Government of Canada or Ministry or agency thereof, under the Local Immigration Partnership for the period April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2013, upon terms and conditions acceptable to the Regional Solicitor and the Commissioner of Social Services for the purpose of funding the Local Immigration Partnership;

AND THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve entering into agreements with agencies or consultants, as determined by the Commissioner of Social Services from time to time, to support the implementation of the Waterloo Region Immigration Partnership Strategic Plan for the period April 1 2011 to March 31, 2013, subject to receipt of Federal Government funding;

AND FURTHER THAT the Operating Budget for Social Planning, Policy and Program Administration be increased by $600,000 gross and $0 net for the period April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2013 as outlined in report SS-11-013/CA-11-004 dated March 8, 2011.

CARRIED

REPORTS – Social Services

a) SS-11-012, Homelessness Partnering Strategy

Lynn Randall, Director, Social Planning, Policy and Program Administration, highlighted the recommendations, provided the funding history and referred to the correspondence received from Minister Finley – item 7c). She stated that the Homelessness Partnering Strategy Community Plan 2011-1014 will be submitted to the federal government and a copy will be
made available in the Councillors’ library. She summarized the funding arrangements and the proposed funding allocations.

L. Randall responded to Committee questions about funding of aboriginal projects. Councillor Brewer congratulated staff for the projects undertaken and the community partnerships developed to date and advised that she is supportive of the ‘B List’ housing projects in the current budget issue papers continuing to receive Regional funding.

MOVED by T. Cowan
SECONDED by B. Halloran

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo continue to serve in the role of Community Entity and, in its capacity as such, enter into agreements with the Federal Government of Canada or a Ministry or agency thereof, under the Homelessness Partnering Strategy for the period April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2014, upon terms and conditions acceptable to Legal Services, for the purposes of providing funding to projects based on the priorities identified in the Homelessness Partnering Strategy Community Plan 2011-2014;

AND THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the Homelessness Partnering Strategy Community Plan 2011-2014;

AND THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve entering into agreements with the following agencies for the maximum amount identified for the period April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2014, subject to receipt of Federal Government funding;

- Lutherwood $302,314
- K-W Working Centre for the Unemployed $375,000
- Young Women’s Christian Association of KW $180,000
- Cambridge Shelter Corporation $180,000

AND THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve entering into agreements with agencies or consultants, as determined by the Commissioner of Social Services from time to time, subject to receipt of Federal Government funding, to support implementation of the following:

- Homelessness Individual and Family Information System to a maximum of $25,389 for the period April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2014;
- An Aboriginal specific project(s) to a maximum of $33,900 for the period April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2014;
- STEP Home program evaluation to a maximum of $30,000 for the period April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2014; and
- Supportive Housing of Waterloo (SHOW) to a maximum $35,000 for the period January 1, 2011 to March 31, 2011 utilizing any unexpended funding under the current Homelessness Partnering Strategy ending March 31, 2011;

AND FURTHER THAT the Operating Budget for Social Planning, Policy and Program Administration be increased by $331,354 gross and $0 net, for the year 2011 as outlined in Report SS-11-012, dated March 8, 2011.

CARRIED
b) SS-11-014, Homeless Individuals and Families Information System Local Coordination Project (2011-2012)

MOVED by B. Halloran
SECONDED by C. Millar

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve entering into an extension of the funding Agreement in the additional amount of up to $57,963 with the Federal Government of Canada or a Ministry or agency thereof for continued local coordination of the Homeless Individuals and Families Information System (HIFIS) for the period April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2012;

AND THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into an Agreement with the House of Friendship of Kitchener for up to $21,326 for continued delivery of certain aspects of the Homeless Individuals and Families Information System (HIFIS) for the period April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2012;

AND THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into an Agreement(s) with consultant(s), as determined by the Commissioner of Social Services from time to time, for up to a maximum of $15,600 collectively for continued delivery of certain aspects of the Homeless Individuals and Families Information System (HIFIS) for the period April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2012;

AND THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, Social Planning, Policy and Program Administration use the remaining $21,037 to offset the Region Staff time contribution to the Homelessness Individuals and Families Information System (HIFIS) and use this funding towards the further implementation of the Homelessness to Housing Stability Strategy as determined by the Commissioner of Social Services from time to time for the period April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2012;

AND FURTHER THAT the 2011 Operating Budget for Social Planning be increased by $43,472 gross and $0 net as outlined in Report SS-11-014, dated March 8, 2011.

CARRIED

REPORTS – Public Health

a) PH-11-008, Smoke-Free Policy For New Leases and Transfers in Regionally Owned Community Housing: Report of Evaluation Findings

Dr. Nolan made brief comments and introduced Stephanie Ellens-Clark, Public Health Planner and Jonathan Mall, Manager, Tobacco & Cancer Prevention, who gave a presentation to the Committee; a copy is appended to the original minutes.

J. Mall identified the partners involved in the multi-faceted evaluation which included a tenant survey and an air quality study, both of which were conducted prior to the implementation of the Regional smoke-free policy. He highlighted the key findings of the report, which included the overwhelming support for the policy identified by survey respondents and the evidence of second-hand smoke in all the properties studied.

S. Ellens-Clark provided an overview of the tenant survey methods and statistics related to the responses. She advised that the first post-policy survey will take place later this year and that a staff report will come back to the Committee. She provided information about the air quality study conducted, giving data for concentrations in the common areas of the various locations and stated that the data collected in 2010 is currently being analysed. She noted that
household surveys will be conducted annually until 2013 and that a grant is being sought to undertake qualitative interviews with tenants.

Received for information.

b) PH-11-009, Fluoride Varnish Program in Selected Elementary Schools and Enhanced Surveillance

Dr. Robert Hawkins, Dental Consultant, made introductory comments and advised that favourable outcomes have been reported in the pilot program and, if budget approval is received, this program will be offered in selected high-risk schools.

In response to a Committee inquiry about the potential perception by City of Waterloo residents who may have expressed their objection to fluoridated water in the past, Dr. Nolan stated that the proposed program will not be universally-offered within the Region; it will be targeted to elementary students at high-risk schools and treatment will only proceed with parental consent. She stated that this safe, preventative treatment doesn’t replace the former water fluoridation program. Dr. Nolan and Dr. Hawkins responded to Committee questions regarding the pilot program and public awareness of the proposed fluoride varnish program.

Chair Seiling stated that the referendum question in the past municipal election dealt with mass water fluoridation using chemicals and that those individuals who weren’t in support of water fluoridation were aware that fluoride was available in other forms. He stated that it would be irresponsible of the Region not to offer this program.

Mike Murray, Chief Administrative Officer, reminded the Committee that the issue of alternative measures were raised a number of times during the fluoride debate and that Dr. Nolan often discussed interventions for high-risk populations.

B. Halloran offered her support of the program, indicated her interest in gaining insight about the marketing plan and asked that Public Health staff make a presentation to City of Waterloo Council. Dr. Nolan advised that this could be arranged, pending Council budget approval.

Received for information.

c) PH-11-010, Ontario Public Health Organizational Standards

Dr. Nolan stated that the Region’s Public Health programs already meet most of the standards but that there is a requirement to document compliance and devise new business processes to meet the standards. Staff will be preparing an implementation plan and will seek Council approval once the standards have been thoroughly reviewed.

Received for information.

d) PH-11-011, Mutual Aid Agreement

Dr. Nolan advised that the agreement and the related by-law require updating and revision. She responded to Committee questions regarding the role of a replacement acting Medical Officer of Health, the operating guidelines and policies for the carriage of that role and the selection of a temporary replacement.
MOVED by G. Lorentz
SECONDED by L. Armstrong

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo:

(a) enter into a mutual aid agreement with other health units, as attached as Appendix “A”;
(b) provide the Medical Officer of Health and the Associate Medical Officer of Health with all necessary authority to carry out the terms and conditions of the mutual aid agreement; and
(c) enact A By-law to Appoint an Acting Medical Officer of Health, as attached as Appendix “B”,


CARRIED

e) PH-11-013, EMS Master Plan Update

Dr. Nolan made introductory comments and introduced John Prno, Director, Emergency Medical Services, who provided the Committee with a presentation; a copy is appended to the original minutes.

J. Prno stated that this is the first progress report made on the overall EMS Master Plan and that progress has been made in all areas. He stated that the dispatch model is making slow but steady progress. He advised that staff has prepared a budget issue paper with staffing requirements and that this is the first time in two years that staffing enhancement has been requested. He responded to a Committee question regarding the anticipated implementation timeframe for the dispatch model and its current challenges.

J. Prno shared with the Committee the impact of hospital offload delays on emergency resources and response times. He advised that the delays are part of a complex health-care wide issue and provided an overview of the provincial mutual aid system and the Code Red coverage levels. He provided charted data and anecdotal examples of the incidents and impact of hospital offload delays, citing February 14, 2011 as a key example of a worst case scenario when no ambulances were available. He stated that Public Health staff has met regularly with the Community Care Access Centre and senior hospital staff regarding system capacity and patient flow measures. He identified the actions taken to date and the impact on those involved in the offload delays.

J. Prno responded to Committee questions regarding the roles of Emergency Room nurses in minimizing delays, the Region’s incidence of response to Code Red for neighbouring municipalities and the experiences of other municipalities. He advised that the problem is health-care wide and not easily resolved by additional hospitals ambulances.

In response to general agreement from the Committee of the urgent need to advocate for change, Dr. Nolan stated that the Region is working closely with hospitals and other local health-care bodies to collaborate on effective solutions. M. Murray suggested that key elements of the issue are hospital capacity and alternative level of care patients; if we had more supportive housing programs, local hospitals would be able to free up beds and this might possibly resolve the off-loading issue.

J. Prno responded to Committee inquires related to the impact of extended workdays on paramedic staff, the obligation and responsibility threshold for ambulance-delivered patients and
the impact of Emergency Room and ambulance overuse. He clarified that paramedics are responsible for their patients until hospital staff accept them as their patients. He stated that Public Health is seeking ways to work with patients who frequently access ambulance services and that Code Red situations typically deal with acute emergencies.

In response to the Committee’s genuine concern for offloading delays, Dr. Nolan advised that staff will come back once a coordinated collaborative appeal and/or proposals have been determined.

Received for information.

INFORMATION/CORRESPONDENCE

a) Memo: Online Application

M. Schuster advised that the application should be available to Ontario Works applicants by mid-May and that he will attempt to arrange for a live demonstration to the Committee.

Received for information.

b) Memo: Ontario Works Caseload February 2011

M. Schuster advised that the data wasn’t available for the meeting but that the memo will be distributed to Councillors.

c) Correspondence: Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development Re: Homelessness Partnering Strategy

Received for information.

d) Correspondence: Ministry of Children and Youth Services Re: Best Start Child and Family Centres in Ontario

Received for information.

OTHER BUSINESS

a) Council Enquiries and Requests for Information Tracking List was received for information.

NEXT MEETING – Tuesday, April 12, 2011

ADJOURN

MOVED by K. Seiling
SECONDED by T. Cowan

THAT the meeting adjourn at 3:17 p.m.

CARRIED

COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR, J. Mitchell

COMMITTEE CLERK, S. Natolochny
Present were: Vice-Chair G. Lorentz, L. Armstrong, *J. Brewer, T. Galloway, J. Haalboom, C. Millar, and K. Seiling


DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST UNDER THE MUNICIPAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT

None declared.

OPEN REMARKS

Vice-Chair G. Lorentz provided opening remarks regarding the purpose of the meeting and the advertisement history.

REPORT – TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

a) E-11-027, Weber Street (College Street to Union Street) Environmental Assessment and Preliminary Design Study – Public Input Meeting for Preferred Design Concept

Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Planning, Housing and Community Services introduced Peter Linn, Project Manager.

*J. Brewer entered the meeting at 7:12 p.m.

P. Linn provided a detailed presentation. He highlighted the Project Description, the Key Plan, Why improvements are required, Existing Traffic Congestion, Project Teams Preferred Solution, Four Design Concepts, Evaluation of Design Concept, Preferred Design Concept B, Consequences of Implementation, Benefits of Preferred Design Concept, Extensive Public Consultation and Next Steps. A copy of the presentation is appended to the original minutes.

In response to questions from the Committee about property acquisitions, P. Linn advised that 43 properties would be acquired, 10 being commercial properties and 33 being residential properties.

DELEGATIONS

Vice-Chair G. Lorentz made a call for delegations.

i) Dennis Killion, 88-90 Weber Street West appeared before Committee representing many of the properties on Weber Street from College to Water Street. He noted that on the original plan
the properties were slated as total acquisitions but after meeting with P. Linn he noted that 20-
25 feet is only needed from some of the properties and the depths of the properties are only 150
feet, he noted that he would be willing to sever the front of the property and buy back the
residual. He also raised concerns with widening the sidewalks and snow removal on those
sidewalks.

P. Linn highlighted that the sidewalks that are being proposed for this project is the standard
width 2.1 meters and are also proposing boulevards between the sidewalks and the curbs.

ii) Ron McCarthy, 311 Weber Street West appeared before Committee inquiring about how
many lanes Weber Street was going to be once the construction was completed.

P. Linn noted that Weber Street would be widened to four lanes and where Weber Street was
already four lanes he indicated the street would still be widened to meet standards. He also
noted that there would be a left turn lane on Weber Street turning onto Victoria Street.

iii) Michael Devoy, 127 Weber Street West appeared before Committee inquiring about the
value of his business property. He noted that this property is valued very high for his business
because of its location. He noted that his business works very closely with the Waterloo District
Catholic School Board which is in walking distance to his business so they don’t have to pay for
parking. It is also in walking distance to other amenities.

Steve van De Keere, Head, Transportation Expansion Program briefly described the acquisition
process and noted that Mr. Devoy could bring up the value of his business during negotiations.

iv) Rob Martin, 76 Northmanor Cres. appeared before Committee looking for clarification on the
multi-use trail. He asked that staff consider posting signs indicating to cyclists and pedestrians
that they are sharing the space.

P. Linn noted that multi-use trails are being proposed but that ultimately it will be Council making
the final decision on multi-use trails or cycling lanes.

v) Brian Bee, 318 Duke Street West appeared before Committee expressing his concern with
providing service roads to Breithaupt Street and suggested building a cul-de-sac to minimize
property acquisitions. He inquired about the Via Station and wondered if access from Ahrens
Street would be updated and if the Via Station would be moved to the new transit hub when it is
built.

T. Schmidt highlighted that the Via Station would be part of the new transit hub. He also noted
that there is not a firm timing on when the new transit hub will be built.

P. Linn noted that the same amount of properties would be acquired if there was a service road
or not. He also indicated that GO Transit has indicated that GO will be using the current Via
Station in the interim until the new transit hub is built. P. Linn noted that he will discuss with Via
and GO about updated access from Ahrens Street since the property is owned by them.

vi) Helen Lippert, 247 Louisa Street appeared before Committee with respect to the corner of
Ahrens Street and Wellington Street. She expressed concerns that when construction begins
that traffic is going to pick up at that corner and asked that a 4 way stop be installed or flashers
be reinstalled on the stop signs there. She also asked that gates or flashers be put at the CN
crossing there.
P. Linn noted that they haven’t looked at the routing of traffic yet and will keep in mind installing flashers on the stop signs and at the rail crossing.

vii) Steve and Alena Browne, 122 Breithaupt Street appeared before Committee expressing their concerns with installing stairwells and ramps. They feel that installing stairwells will be a spot for criminal activity to occur and for questionable people to hang around in. They also noted that they currently are the third house in on their street but once construction is completed they will be the corner house. They inquired about compensation to the residents who will be staying through the construction and asked if a fence would be built. They also inquired about installing a sidewalk on a one way service road.

Vice-Chair G. Lorentz asked staff to meet with the Browne’s to discuss their concerns with them.

viii) Bill Schiebel, 100 Weber Street West appeared before Committee inquiring about all the properties being purchased at once and questioned where the construction would start.

S. van De Keere noted that all properties have to be acquired at the beginning of the project. He highlighted that staging hasn't been discussed because it is subject to Council approval in the spring, following that EA studies will be completed and the project will be approved at the end of the summer. He indicated that staging will be approved in early 2012.

ADJOURN

MOVED by T. Galloway
SECONDED by C. Millar

THAT the meeting adjourn at 8:20 p.m.

CARRIED

COMMITTEE VICE-CHAIR, G. Lorentz

COMMITTEE CLERK, E. Flewwelling
Present were: Chair K. Seiling, L. Armstrong, J. Brewer, T. Cowan, D. Craig, T. Galloway, J. Haalboom, B. Halloran, R. Kelterborn, G. Lorentz, C. Millar, J. Mitchell

Cambridge Council: D. Craig, D. Reid, P. Wolf

Kitchener Council: S. Davey, K. Galloway, J. Gazzola, B. Ioannidis, Z. Janecki, B. Vrbanovic

North Dumfries Council: B. Benninger, S. Foxton, G. Taylor


Wellesley Council: P. Hergott, R. Kelterborn, J. Olender

Wilmot Council: L. Armstrong, P. Roe

Woolwich Council: T. Cowan, M. Bauman, B. Bryant, J. Herteis, A. Poffenroth

*Mayors are shown in attendance for both Regional Council and their own Council due to quorum requirements.


Welcome

Chair Ken Seiling welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Canada’s Technology Triangle (CTT) Update

John Jung, Chief Executive Officer, CTT made a presentation on CTT. A copy of the presentation is appended to the original minutes. J. Jung provided the background information, vision and mission, strategic plan, supporting objectives, focus on foreign direct investment, attraction factors, CTT’s facilitative leadership role, message about the Region, key sectors, talent and collaboration, how they tell the story, breakdown of opportunities, interaction with international companies, local leadership, global impact, successes, return on investment, case study, recognition, revenue breakdown, board of directors, staff and partners.

Members present had no questions on the presentation. Chair Seiling thanked J. Jung for his presentation.
Rapid Transit Update

Chair Seiling advised this will be a summary of the presentation made to Regional Council and is for information purposes. The intent is not to debate the merits of rapid transit.

Mike Murray, Chief Administrative Officer, Region of Waterloo appeared before the meeting and provided an update on the Rapid Transit project. A copy of the presentation is appended to the original minutes. M. Murray highlighted the growth projections/challenges, rapid transit background, BRT/aBRT/LRT comparison, current rapid transit options, consultation process/timing.

Following the presentation, M. Murray responded to questions about how the Townships can be added into the system down the road. He advised currently municipalities that get transit service pay for the service. Chair Seiling noted they are currently reviewing how to extend transit into the Townships.

An inquiry was made if the funding from the Provincial and Federal governments is time limited. Chair Seiling replied the agreements and documents have not yet been seen so timing is not known yet.

It was noted there has been misinformation about the potential financial implications for the project.

Collaborative Initiative on A-Z Services, Website Portal

David Calder, General Manager, Corporate Services, City of Waterloo and Linda Fegan, Director Corporate Communications & Marketing, City of Cambridge appeared before the meeting. D. Calder provided background information on how the project got to this point. L. Fegan provided a live demonstration of the website and stated a media release will be issued today about the portal.

In response to a question, D. Calder advised the group will continue to monitor the usage of the portal and expand the terms if required.

Waterloo Region Tourism Marketing Corporation – Update

Mark Bingeman, President, Bingemans appeared at the meeting and provided an update on the Waterloo Region Tourism Marketing Corporation (WRTMC). A copy of the presentation is appended to the original minutes. He highlighted the partnership model, structure, board of directors, staff, strategic plan, executive summary, tourism impact, key successes, what is new for 2011-2012, new Regional Tourism Organizations (RTO) established by the Province, arts portal and collaboration.

A question was raised regarding why the WRTMC and St. Jacobs Country have separate recognition under the RTO area. M. Bingeman responded there is significant history with St. Jacobs Country and also with Elora/Fergus which are also separate. Doing this separate recognition allows for people with strong marketing knowledge to be at the table. The summer and fall campaigns for RTO4 were noted. It is currently unknown what will happen with funding after the first two years.
There was further discussion about the funding from the municipalities and if it will decrease in the future. M. Bingeman stated there has been a significant hit to the travel and tourism industry due to the economic downturn.

M. Bingeman provided a demonstration of their website and encouraged everyone to visit it.

**Closing Comments**

K. Seiling provided closing remarks and thanked everyone for attending the meeting today.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

**REGIONAL CHAIR, K. Seiling**

**REGIONAL DEPUTY CLERK, L. Wetzel**
March 16, 2011

Ministry of Community and Social Services
Madeleine Meilleur, Minister

VIA E-MAIL

The Grand River Accessibility Advisory Committee would like to commend the Government of Ontario on their continued efforts to make Ontario a truly accessible province. We recognize the scope of this job, as you try to meet the needs of, not only the challenged community, but the various municipalities, companies, and organizations, who will be impacted by this legislation.

We are grateful for the opportunity to voice our suggestions and concerns on the Integrated Accessibility Standards. In general, we would like some thought given to:

- Timelines – are all timelines consistent? Has too much time been allowed, in some cases, for organizations to become compliant?

- Employment- are employers being given too much latitude for their workplaces to become compliant? The challenged community has historically been underemployed or unemployed. Every opportunity should be given for these Ontarians to be contributing members of our society.

- Transportation- in an effort to recognize budgeting restraints, is the challenged community being treated unfairly with regards to accessible transit? Accessibility needs to apply to all aspects, financial included, and this accessibility must apply to all the weather we experience in our province.

More explanation is detailed on the following pages.

Once again, thank you for listening to our concerns, and for all the attention you are giving this giant step forward.

Respectfully Submitted,

Gordon Cummer, Co-Chair.
Sharon Giles, Co-Chair
Grand River Accessibility Advisory Committee

(c.c. – Vanessa Lopack, Social Planning Associate, AODA / ODA, Region of Waterloo)
Comments of Integrated Accessibility Standard
Grand River Accessibility Advisory Committee

Part I – General

Establishment of accessibility policies

3. While it is wonderful to ask for accessibility policies – and we can only strongly support this – but the regulation seems to leave it up to each business to decide what this will be. Without any rules, guidelines or benchmarks, it is difficult to see how an accessibility policy will make any difference.

Accessibility Plans

4. We question the 5 year planning cycle proposed. The ODA currently requires annual plans.

Our experience has been that a good portion of an accessibility plan covers improvements to the built environment. Since various factors can effect the implementation of such plans, they are dynamic. A five year plan will not adequately respond to changes and priorities. An annual written report to review the plan would allow more response to change, and keep the municipalities accountable.

Procuring or Acquiring Goods, Services or Facilities

5. (1) The term “not practicable” is very loose. There should be a definition which defines the limits of this term.

This could be interpreted to be exclusionary, and perhaps it needs to be amended to state that it will not be practicable only if it is cost prohibitive or will cause undue hardship.

Self-service kiosks

6. (2) The wording “…shall have regard to the accessibility for persons with disabilities…” is unclear. Does it mean that they must meet a standard?

It is also unclear if this would apply to automatic banking machines and other similar terminals which are not necessarily kiosks.
Exemption from Filing Accessibility Reports

8. (1)
The exemption of small organizations from filing reports could mean that they lose sight of the importance of the standards. Perhaps they could be required to submit an annual checklist or letter of compliance.

Part II
Information and Communications Standards

Feedback

11. (3)
The timelines for this section seem long, given the small amount of work involved. We think that, in most cases, they could be moved up one or even two years.

Accessible Formats and Communication Supports

12. (1) 1
“...in a timely manner...” is vague. Could this require that a summary of the contents of the material be reviewed either verbally or in writing within a fixed period (1 day or 3 days) before the delivery of the complete converted material?

Timelines – Given the importance of effective accessible communications, we think that government and large organizations should meet earlier effective dates.....at least one year earlier and, for large organizations, two years (2014).

Emergency Procedure, Plans or Public Safety Information

13. (1)
If this is to be made available when visiting the site, this should require that at least one person in the organization be available at all times to communicate the information. This will ensure that there is back-up for the primary person if they are absent.

Accessible Websites and Web Content

NOTE: Reference is made to the World Wide Web Consortium Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.0. If there is an update to these standards, how is this to be handled?

14. (3) 3
The time required to meet full compliance (2020) for all websites seems excessively long.
14. (4) 2

As above.

Also, why are these organizations exempt from having full compliance (including Captions and Audio Descriptions)?

**Producers of Educational or Training Material**

17. (3) 2

The date of 2020 is too long since other materials such as text books have a 2015 date. Are not all of these materials of equal importance when used in education and training?

**Libraries of Educational and Training Institutions**

18. (3) 2.

The 2020 date for digital or multimedia resources or materials is too long given that such materials may well be readily converted.

**Part III
Employment Standards**

In this section, timelines could be shortened considerably, since the regulation adds nothing that is not already in place under human rights legislation.

**Scope and Interpretation**

20. (1)

The standards set out in this Part apply to obligated organizations that are employers and,

(b) “do not apply in respect of volunteers and other non-paid individuals.”

There is a serious concern about this exemption. So many people with disabilities rely on volunteer experience to get future jobs. This gives them some equity for job market entry recruitment, assessment, or selection.

While a strict application of these requirements to volunteers would likely discourage an organization from engaging any volunteers, a complete exemption would mean volunteers would not be as well prepared to assume employment. For example, Section 25 - Informing employees of supports, Section 26 - Accessible formats and communication supports for employees, and Section 27 - Workplace emergency response information would apply to volunteers in the organization.
Recruitment, Assessment or Selection Process

23. (3)
“The decision as to which accommodation is to be provided rests with the employer.”

This is a large loophole which would allow the employer to avoid interviewing a disabled person. Should there be a reference to the Human Rights Code here?

The employer should offer accommodation to the point of undue hardship. While it is necessary not to make it too onerous for employers to hire persons with disabilities by mandating all manner of restrictive rules, it is equally important to give persons with disabilities – who have historically been underemployed or unemployed – the chance to request and receive accommodations in every step of the employment process to maximize the chances of retention and promotion.

Workplace Emergency Response Information

27. (2) & (4)
If there is a designated person, a new designated person should be named if either party moves to another position.

Part IV
Transportation Standards

Availability of information on accessibility equipment etc.

34. (1) & (2)
We would like to have more clarity on the format for this information with a web site as a minimum.

Non-functioning accessibility equipment

35. (1)
“reasonable steps” and “as soon as is practicable” are very unspecific. These should be tighter.

In previous drafts of this standard, service providers were required to make regular inspections of the equipment. This has been dropped. We believe that it is an important requirement.

Accessibility Training

36.
There should be a provision to include people with disabilities in the design and delivery of the training.

Fares, support persons

38. (2)
Does the Ministry have any suggestions as to how a support person should be identified or designated?

Accessibility Plans, Conventional Transportation Services.
41. (2)
There should also be an opportunity for the public to comment on other accessibility issues at these meetings.
If an Accessibility Advisory Committee as required under the ODA exists, their comments should also be sought.

Accessibility plans, specialized transportation services

42. (1)
Does the Ministry have a suggested methodology for estimating demand?

Service Disruptions

50. a)
“make available alternate accessible arrangements to transfer persons with disabilities to their route destination where alternate arrangements for persons without disabilities are inaccessible”

The meaning of this is not clear.

Allocated Mobility Aid Spaces

55. a) i.
Is this because the smaller vehicles are not as wide?

Accessibility, Rail Cars

62. (1)
Does this apply to existing equipment/trains?

Specialized Transportation Service Providers

Categories of eligibility

63
This is a confusing requirement that does not improve the transportation situation for people with disabilities. It also requires the operator to determine the eligibility of each potential user initially and at the time of a request for service.
For example: In the winter snowy sidewalks between the users location and a conventional transit stop may eliminate their ability to get to the stop. How would the operator determine this?
Another example would be when a user has sufficient mobility to reach a close transit stop but not have the ability to reach their destination when it is far away from a stop. How would the operator determine this when deciding whether to supply the specialized service when requested?
On implementation dates, the requirement date is 2017 but in Section 64, the requirement date for the application process design is 3 years earlier (2014).

Fare parity

66. If Fare Parity means the same fare for either type of service, then many conventional transit service providers will not be able to extend a no charge fare, as we do in our Region, to eligible people with disabilities. This would impose a hardship on these individuals, who are often on a fixed income, and reduce their ability to fully participate in the community. A no charge fare for conventional transit also serves to encourage people with disabilities to use this service as much as possible.

Booking

71. ‘...provide same day service to the extent that it is available”
What does this mean? Does this mean that they should provide same day service? The lack of same day service can impose a barrier to many people. We would like to see this required.

Duties of Municipalities, General

78. (3) The council of every municipality described in subsection 29 (1) of the Act shall consult with its municipal accessibility advisory committee, the public and persons with disabilities to determine the proportion of on-demand accessible taxicabs required in the community. (4) The council of every municipality described in subsection 29 (1) of the Act shall identify progress made toward meeting the need for accessible taxicabs in its accessibility plan required under Part I.

Does this give the municipality the legal power to require that a taxi company provide accessible taxis?
TO: Regional Chair Ken Seiling and Members of Regional Council

DATE: March 23, 2011

SUBJECT: T2011-004 ST. AGATHA TRUNK WATERMAIN ERB’S ROAD (WILMOT LINE TO NOTRE DAME DRIVE) TOWNSHIP OF WILMOT

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo accept the tender of Sierra Construction (Woodstock) Limited for T2011-004, St. Agatha Trunk Watermain, Erb’s Road (Wilmot Line to Notre Dame Drive), Township of Wilmot, at a total price of $2,844,531.42 including all applicable taxes.

SUMMARY: Nil

REPORT:

Tenders were called for the St. Agatha Trunk Watermain, Erb’s Road (Wilmot Line to Notre Dame Drive), Township of Wilmot and were opened in the presence of L. Wilson, B. Khan and G. Treadwell.

The following bids were received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Construction (Woodstock) Limited</td>
<td>Woodstock, ON</td>
<td>$2,844,531.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanna &amp; Hamilton Construction Co. Ltd.</td>
<td>Listowel, ON</td>
<td>$2,952,215.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terracon Underground Ltd.</td>
<td>Brantford, ON</td>
<td>$3,129,769.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Site Services Ltd.</td>
<td>Cambridge, ON</td>
<td>$3,151,380.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steed &amp; Evans Limited</td>
<td>Heidelberg, ON</td>
<td>$3,156,227.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terra-Alta Construction Ltd.</td>
<td>Cambridge, ON</td>
<td>$3,434,973.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bel-Air Excavating &amp; Grading Ltd.</td>
<td>Cambridge, ON</td>
<td>$5,263,778.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The work of the contract is for the installation and commissioning of a trunk watermain to provide water from the Zone 7 Pumping Station at Wilmot Line to the Village of St. Agatha.

The work also includes but is not limited to:

a) installation of approximately 3,860 metres of 200 mm diameter watermain;
b) road reconstruction within the Village of St. Agatha;
c) installation of approximately 350 metres of 300 mm diameter watermain on Erb’s Road east of Wilmot Line, on behalf of the City of Waterloo;
d) modifications to the existing well house in St. Agatha;
e) surface water drainage upgrades and storm sewer installations at a Regional water well site adjacent to Erb’s Road; and
f) associated civil works, process upgrades and system and watermain testing and commissioning.
In 2005, the Region completed a Schedule B Class Environmental Assessment (EA) which identified the construction of a watermain from the Integrated Urban System in Waterloo to St. Agatha as the preferred long term solution for supplying water to St. Agatha. The St. Agatha Watermain will provide water to St. Agatha via a watermain to be installed along Erb’s Road from the Zone 7 Pumping Station located at Wilmot Line and Erb’s Road and be connected in the village of St Agatha at the intersection of Erb’s Road and Notre Dame Drive. Construction of the new watermain is pre-approved as a Schedule A+ project under the Municipal Class EA.

The water provided via the St. Agatha watermain will replace water which is currently provided through local Regional water supply wells. Once the watermain is constructed and commissioned the existing water supply wells will be disconnected from the St. Agatha water distribution system and decommissioned. Those property owners within the village of St. Agatha and along Erb’s Road who are currently connected to the municipal water supply system will be connected to the new watermain at no cost, since the applicable current users in the village of St. Agatha have already prepaid their share of the watermain costs.

To accommodate the proposed road reconstruction works within the village of St. Agatha, Erb’s Road from the intersection at Notre Dame Drive to Strauss Court will be closed to through traffic for an estimated period of approximately 4 weeks during April to May 2011. During the time that Erb’s Road within the village of St. Agatha is closed, a detour will be in place to divert traffic travelling westward along Erb Street/Erb’s Road, south along Ira Needles to Highland Road/Snyder’s Road, westward to Notre Dame Drive and north to Erb’s Road. This detour will similarly divert eastbound traffic travelling along Erb’s Road west of Notre Dame Drive along the same route.

MOE Certificates of Approval for the Region watermain and the City of Waterloo watermain are expected to be received prior to contract execution. An agreement with Hydro One Networks Inc. (HONI) is expected to be received prior to installation of water services within the HONI easement. An amendment to the existing MOE Certificate of Approval is expected to be received prior to any modifications to the existing St. Agatha well house. No other external approvals are required for this contract.

Subject to Council approval, the construction work of this contract is scheduled to commence in April 2011 with substantial completion expected in July 2011.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

Award of this contract meets the Corporate Strategic Plan Objective to “optimize the use of existing infrastructure and ensure it is adequately maintained” under Strategic Focus Area 5 to “provide high quality infrastructure and asset management to meet current needs and future growth.”

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Contract T2011-004 costs are shared as follows:

| Region of Waterloo, Water Services Division | $1,971,933.95 |
| Region of Waterloo, Transportation Division | 313,517.49 |
| City of Waterloo | 231,833.00 |
| **Sub-total** | **$2,517,284.44** |
| **HST** | **327,246.98** |
| **Total** | **$2,844,531.42** |
Cost Sharing Summary

Region of Waterloo Water Services Division Costs

Based on the low tender submission, the estimated costs for the Region of Waterloo Water Services Division on this contract are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T2011-004 – St. Agatha Trunk Watermain</td>
<td>$1,971,933.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2010-029 – Zone 7 Booster Station Upgrades (previously awarded)</td>
<td>430,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Purchased Equipment</td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Engineering &amp; Contract Administration</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Testing</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits &amp; Approvals (no HST)</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional In-house Engineering &amp; Construction Inspection (no HST)</td>
<td>130,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,941,933.95</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HST</strong></td>
<td><strong>364,251.41</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total Including HST</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,306,185.36</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less: Municipal Rebate of 86.46% of HST (11.24%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(314,937.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,991,247.98</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Region of Waterloo’s approved 2011 Water Capital Budget and Ten Year Capital Forecast includes $3,010,000 for the Water Services work for the St. Agatha Watermain Project (Project 04150 - $2,810,000) and the SCADA Communication Upgrade (Project 04969 - $200,000) to be funded from the Regional Development Charge and Water Reserve Funds. The net total estimated cost of $2,991,247.98 to complete the Water Services portion of the work is less than 1% ($18,752.02) difference of the $3,010,000 budget provided in the 2011 Water Capital Program. Unless otherwise directed by Council, the remaining funds of $18,752.02 will remain in the appropriate reserve funds.

Region of Waterloo Transportation Division Costs

Based on the low tender submission, the estimated costs for the Region of Waterloo Transportation Division on this contract are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T2011-004 – St. Agatha Trunk Watermain</td>
<td>$313,517.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Engineering &amp; Contract Administration</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Testing</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional In-house Engineering &amp; Construction Inspection (no HST)</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$403,517.49</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HST</strong></td>
<td><strong>50,507.28</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total Including HST</strong></td>
<td><strong>$454,024.77</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less: Municipal Rebate of 86.46% of HST (11.24%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(43,669.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$410,355.40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The draft 2011 Ten-Year Transportation Capital Program includes a budget of $905,000 (Project 05613) for the reconstruction of Erb’s Road from Notre Dame Drive to the east limits of St. Agatha in 2011 and the surface asphalt for this section of road plus resurfacing of Notre Dame Drive from Erb’s Road to the south limits of St. Agatha in 2012. The total tender-based cost of $410,355.40 for the 2011 reconstruction work, plus the estimated cost of $300,000 for the surface asphalt and resurfacing work in 2012 equates to $710,355.40. The resulting cost to complete the Transportation portion of the work is $194,644.60 below the $905,000 budget provided in the draft...
2011 Ten-Year Transportation Capital Program. The tender-based cost in 2011 plus the cost to complete the 2012 works is less than originally budgeted because during the detailed design phase of the Erb’s Road reconstruction, it was decided to provide wider shared-use traffic lanes instead of constructing designated bike lanes in the village of St. Agatha. This will match the shared-use traffic lanes provided on the recently reconstructed section of Erb’s Road west of Notre Dame Drive and avoids the need to widen the road, move curbs, catchbasins and utility poles, and restore the asphalt boulevard. In addition, it was determined during the detailed design phase that a budgeted replacement of a culvert was not required at this time. Reallocation of the remaining funds of $194,644.60 will be addressed during the 2011 Mid-Year review of the Transportation Capital Program.

City of Waterloo Costs

Based on the low tender submission, the estimated costs for the City of Waterloo on this contract are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T2011-004 – St. Agatha Trunk Watermain</td>
<td>$231,833.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Engineering &amp; Contract Administration</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Testing</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits &amp; Approvals (no HST)</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional In-house Engineering &amp; Construction Inspection (no HST)</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-total $294,333.00

HST 36,638.29

Sub-total including HST $330,971.29

Less: Municipal Rebate of 86.46% of HST (11.24%) (31,678.03)

Total $299,293.26

The City of Waterloo component of the project works ($299,293.26) is included in the Contract as provisional and will be subject to approval of City of Waterloo Council. City of Waterloo staff plans to present a recommendation to authorize and fund this work to City of Waterloo Council on March 21, 2011. Inclusion or exclusion of the City of Waterloo work does not alter the ranking of the low bid.

The final date of acceptance for this tender is May 2, 2011.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE: Nil

ATTACHMENTS: Nil

PREPARED BY: C. Whitlock, Director, Procurement & Supply Services

APPROVED BY: L. Ryan, Chief Financial Officer
TO: Regional Chair Ken Seiling and Members of Regional Council
DATE: March 23, 2011
FILE CODE: F18-40
SUBJECT: P2011-05 CONTROL SYSTEM RETROFIT AT 99 REGINA ST., WATERLOO

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo accept the proposal of Johnson Controls for P2011-05 Control System Retrofit at 99 Regina St. Waterloo, Ontario at a price of $493,561.00 including all applicable taxes.

SUMMARY: Nil

REPORT:

Proposals were called for the P2011-05 Control System Retrofit at 99 Regina St. Waterloo, Ontario and three companies were invited to submit. The three companies prequalified for this project presently have BAS (Building Automation System) infrastructure within Regional Buildings.

The proposals were opened in the presence of T. Pedlar, R. Van Den Berg, and L. Wilson.

The proposals were reviewed by staff from Facilities Management, Facilities Maintenance and Operations, and a control system consultant. All proposals were evaluated using the following criteria: system design and compliance with specification, implementation plan and schedule, long term product and technical support, project team resources, customer support services, CCDC-11 references and price.

The following proposals were received (including all applicable taxes):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johnson Controls</td>
<td>Burlington, ON</td>
<td>$493,561.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honeywell</td>
<td>Hamilton, ON</td>
<td>$669,300.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One other bid was disqualified.

The bid received from Johnson Controls received the highest overall score and was also the lowest price.

The work of this contract is to replace the existing BAS at the Public Health and Social Services (PHSS) building located at 99 Regina St. Waterloo. This unit is over 17 years old. The existing BAS has shown signs of failure and has become unreliable. Replacement parts and main electronic components are no longer available for the existing technology and complete replacement is necessary to ensure system reliability. We have confirmed with Johnson Controls that replacement parts will be available for 15 years. Johnson Controls have historically been the lower bidder on these types of bids and have provided good service to the Region in the past. The BAS is a key building technology which allows the automated control of
heating, ventilation and air conditioning systems within the PHSS building. It is therefore a central feature in the Region’s energy management and energy reduction efforts for the PHSS building.

**CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

The replacement of the control system at 99 Regina St. will support Focus Area 5 of the Corporate Strategic Plan - Infrastructure: Provide high quality infrastructure and asset management to meet current needs and future growth.

The project also supports Focus Area 1- Environmental Sustainability: Protect and Enhance the Environment, as better control of the HVAC system could equate to greater energy savings.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P2011-05</td>
<td>$436,779.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>64,920.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Security Expenses</td>
<td>35,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Engineering (not subject to HST)</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$566,699.65</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus: HST (13%)</td>
<td>69,770.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$636,470.60</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Municipal Rebate of 86.46% of HST (11.24%)</td>
<td>(60,325.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$576,145.56</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2010 Capital Budget includes $642,000 for the controls retrofit at 99 Regina St funded by debentures.

**OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:** Nil

**ATTACHMENTS:** Nil

**PREPARED BY:** C. Whitlock, Director, Procurement & Supply Services

**APPROVED BY:** L. Ryan, Chief Financial Officer
THE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO
PLANNING AND WORKS COMMITTEE

Summary of Recommendations to Council

The Planning and Works Committee recommends as follows:

1. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo waive the sewage and water connection fee of $20,000, as provided in the Region of Waterloo’s fees and charges bylaw, for the connection to the Air Cadets Youth Development Centre at the Region of Waterloo International Airport as noted in report E-11-032 dated March 8, 2011,

AND THAT if at any time in the future the Air Cadets Youth Development Centre proposes to assign the ground lease, sell or sub-lease the building the Regional Municipality of Waterloo would require the $20,000 connection fee be paid prior to the Region of Waterloo approving of the assignment, sale or sub-lease. Alternatively, should the building be used for any purpose other than the non-profit delivery of youth programs consistent with the mandate of the Royal Canadian Air Cadets, the connection fee shall be become payable.

AND THAT the Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services be authorized to enter into an agreement with the 822 (Tutor) Squadron – Royal Canadian Air Cadets with respect to the waiver of connection fees and provision of water and sanitary service to the Air Cadet facility with such agreement to be to the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor.

2. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to proposed improvements on Bridge Street (Regional Road No. 52) from the Bridgeport Bridge to the Kitchener/Woolwich Boundary in the City of Kitchener:

   a) approve the proposed improvements for Bridge Street as outlined in Report E-11-023; and

   b) amend Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as amended, to provide Reserved Lanes for bicycles on both sides of Bridge Street from the Bridgeport Bridge to the Kitchener/Woolwich Boundary.

3. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the expropriation of the lands for the purposes of construction of road improvements to Trussler Road, in the City of Kitchener and the Township of Wilmot, in the Region of Waterloo as detailed in Report CR-RS-11-012 dated March 8, 2011 described as follows:

Fee Simple Partial Taking:

a. Part Lot 1, Concession 1, Block ‘A’, Township of Wilmot, being Part 1, on Reference Plan 58R-16917, PIN 22186-0234(LT) (1040 Huron Road)

b. Part Lot 1, Concession 1, Block ‘A’, Township of Wilmot, being Part 2, on Reference Plan 58R-16917, PIN 22186-0233(LT) (1465 Trussler Road)

c. Part Lot 1, Concession 1, Block ‘A’, Township of Wilmot, being Part 3, on Reference Plan 58R-16917, PIN 22186-0232(LT) (1359 Trussler Road)
d. Part Lot 136, German Company Tract, City of Kitchener, being Part 5, on Reference Plan 58R-16917, PIN 22728-0010(LT) (1434 Trussler Road)

e. Part Lot 135, German Company Tract, City of Kitchener, being Part 6, on Reference Plan 58R-16917, PIN 22728-0009(LT) (no municipal address)

f. Part Lot 1, Concession South of Bleam’s Road, Township of Wilmot, being Part 7, on Reference Plan 58R-16917, PIN 22186-0211(LT) (1259 Trussler Road)

g. Part Lot 1, Concession South of Bleam’s Road, Township of Wilmot, being Part 8, on Reference Plan 58R-16917, PIN 22186-0210(LT) (1177 Trussler Road)

h. Part Lots 129, 133 & 134, German Company Tract, City of Kitchener, being Part 9, on Reference Plan 58R-16917, PIN 22728-0005(LT) (no municipal address)

i. Part Lot 1, Concession South of Bleam’s Road, Township of Wilmot, being Part 10, on Reference Plan 58R-16917, PIN 22186-0205(LT) (no municipal address)

j. Part Lot 129, German Company Tract, City of Kitchener, being Part 11, on Reference Plan 58R-16917, PIN 22727-0022(LT) (808 Trussler Road)

k. Part Lot 2, Concession 3, Block ‘A’, Township of Wilmot, being Part 1, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, PIN 22207-0377(LT) (2483 Trussler Road)

l. Part Lot 13, Beasley’s New Survey, City of Kitchener, being Part 2, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, PIN 22207-0370(LT) (2878 New Dundee Road)

m. Part Lot 2, Concession 3, Block ‘A’, Township of Wilmot, being Parts 5, 6 and 7, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, PIN 22207-0376(LT) (2113 Trussler Road)

n. Part Lot 2, Concession 2, Block ‘A’, Township of Wilmot, being Part 8, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, PIN 22207-0028(LT) (no municipal address)

o. Part Lot 13, Beasley’s New Survey, City of Kitchener, being Part 9, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, PIN 22723-0036(LT) (no municipal address)

p. Part Lot 13, Beasley’s New Survey, City of Kitchener, being Part 10, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, PIN 22723-0008(LT) (no municipal address)

q. Part Lot 149, German Company Tract, City of Kitchener, being Part 11, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, PIN 22723-0007(LT) (1738 Trussler Road)

r. Part Lot 15, South side of Huron Road, Plan 585 and Part Lot 149, German Company Tract, City of Kitchener, being Part 12, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, PIN 22723-0006(LT) (no municipal address)

s. Part Lot 1, Concession 2, Block ‘A’, Township of Wilmot, being Parts 13 and 14, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, PIN 22207-0025(LT) (1743 Trussler Road)

t. Part Lot 1, South side of Huron Road, Plan 585, City of Kitchener, being Part 15, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, PIN 22723-0004(LT) (1698 Trussler Road)
AND THAT staff be instructed to register a Plan of Expropriation for the property within three
months of the granting of the approval to expropriate the property, as required by the
Expropriations Act;

AND THAT the registered owners be served with a Notice of Expropriation and a Notice of
Possession for the property after the registration of the Plan of Expropriation;

AND THAT if no agreement as to compensation is made with an owner, the statutory Offer
of Compensation and payment be served upon the registered owners of the property in the
amount of the market value of the interests in the land as estimated by the Region’s
appraiser in accordance with the Expropriations Act;

AND FURTHER THAT the Regional Solicitor be authorized to discontinue expropriation
proceedings or any part thereof, in respect of the above described lands, or any part thereof,
upon the registration on title of the required documentation to complete the transaction.
March 8, 2011

4. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo declare a leasehold interest of greater than
twenty-one (21) years in the Lands described as part of Lot 111, German Company Tract of
the Geographic Township of Woolwich, Regional Municipality of Waterloo, being parts 1
and 2 on the draft Reference Plan of Survey attached to Report CR-RS-11-014/E-11-026
dated March 8, 2011 as Appendix A and forming part of Property Identifier 22254-0193
(LT) (the Lands), surplus to its needs, in accordance with the Region’s Property Disposition
By-law;

AND THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo authorize the Commissioner of
Transportation and Environmental Services to enter into a Lease with IP Aviation L.P., by
its general partner, IP Aviation GP Inc., (the Lessee) as described in Report CR-RS-11-
014/E-11-026 dated March 8, 2011 with the form of the lease to be to the satisfaction of the
Regional Solicitor.

5. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo declare a leasehold interest of greater than
twenty-one (21) years in the Lands forming part of Lot 111, German Company Tract of the
Geographic Township of Woolwich, Regional Municipality of Waterloo, being lots 10 and 11
on the plan attached to Report CR-RS-11-016/E-11-037 dated March 8, 2011 as
Appendix A (the Lands), surplus to its needs, in accordance with the Region’s Property
Disposition By-law;

AND THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo authorize the Commissioner of
Transportation and Environmental Services to enter into a Lease with Waterloo Aviation
Corp. (the Lessee) as described in Report CR-RS-11-016/E-11-037 dated March 8, 2011
with the form of the lease to be to the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor.

6. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve and distribute Report P-11-024, Year
End 2010 Population and Household Estimates for the Region of Waterloo, dated March 8,
2011, to interested parties, including the general public, Area Municipalities and the School
Boards.

7. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo extend the Route 21 – Elmira Grand River
Transit pilot service to December 31, 2011, as described in Report P-11-027, dated March 8,
2011 and that funding be provided from the Corporate Capital Levy Reserve Fund.
The Administration and Finance Committee recommends as follows:

1. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo establish a policy for the term of Council that a grant be provided to cover the cost of Regional Development Charges for housing built as a Habitat for Humanity project, with the cost of the grant to be provided from the Housing Reserve Fund, as described in Report F-11-013, dated March 8, 2011.

2. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo:
   a) Declare the lands described as Part Lot 1, Municipal Compiled Plan of Subdivision of Lot 6, German Company Tract, being Part 1, Reference Plan 58R-16677, in the City of Waterloo surplus to the needs of the Region, as detailed in Report No. CR-RS-11-015 dated March 8, 2011, and provide the standard public notification as required by the Region’s property disposition by-law; and
   b) Approve and execute all documentation related to the conveyance of the lands described as Part 1, Reference Plan 58R-16677, at the cost of the Region, to the Corporation of the City of Waterloo for road widening purposes, for the sum of $1.00, as detailed in Report No. CR-RS-11-015 dated March 8, 2011, pursuant to the Region’s property disposition by-law and the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor.

3. THAT the Administration and Finance Committee approve the minutes of the Audit Committee dated February 14, 2011.

March 8, 2011
THE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO
COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE

Summary of Recommendations to Council

The Community Services Committee recommends as follows:

1. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo receive Report P-11-031, Proposed ‘Place of Employment’ Survey, dated March 8, 2011 for information;

   AND THAT this report be distributed to interested parties, including the Area Municipalities and the Canada’s Technology Triangle (CTT), to advise of the initiation of this project, and to request their support in raising awareness.

2. THAT The Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions to raise awareness of the 2011 Census as described in P-11-032, dated March 8, 2011:
   a) Encourage all residents of the Region of Waterloo to provide a complete response to the 2011 Census Form during May, 2011; and
   b) Use available channels, such as the Region of Waterloo website, to direct residents to information about the Census.

3. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo continue to serve as host for the Waterloo Region Immigration Partnership Council and, in its capacity as such, enter into agreements with the Federal Government of Canada or Ministry or agency thereof, under the Local Immigration Partnership for the period April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2013, upon terms and conditions acceptable to the Regional Solicitor and the Commissioner of Social Services for the purpose of funding the Local Immigration Partnership;

   AND THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve entering into agreements with agencies or consultants, as determined by the Commissioner of Social Services from time to time, to support the implementation of the Waterloo Region Immigration Partnership Strategic Plan for the period April 1 2011 to March 31, 2013, subject to receipt of Federal Government funding;

   AND FURTHER THAT the Operating Budget for Social Planning, Policy and Program Administration be increased by $600,000 gross and $0 net for the period April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2013 as outlined in report SS-11-013/CA-11-004 dated March 8, 2011.

4. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo continue to serve in the role of Community Entity and, in its capacity as such, enter into agreements with the Federal Government of Canada or a Ministry or agency thereof, under the Homelessness Partnering Strategy for the period April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2014, upon terms and conditions acceptable to Legal Services, for the purposes of providing funding to projects based on the priorities identified in the Homelessness Partnering Strategy Community Plan 2011-2014;

   AND THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the Homelessness Partnering Strategy Community Plan 2011-2014;
AND THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve entering into agreements with the following agencies for the maximum amount identified for the period April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2014, subject to receipt of Federal Government funding;

- Lutherwood $302,314
- K-W Working Centre for the Unemployed $375,000
- Young Women’s Christian Association of KW $180,000
- Cambridge Shelter Corporation $180,000

AND THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve entering into agreements with agencies or consultants, as determined by the Commissioner of Social Services from time to time, subject to receipt of Federal Government funding, to support implementation of the following:

- Homelessness Individual and Family Information System to a maximum of $25,389 for the period April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2014;
- An Aboriginal specific project(s) to a maximum of $33,900 for the period April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2014;
- STEP Home program evaluation to a maximum of $30,000 for the period April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2014; and
- Supportive Housing of Waterloo (SHOW) to a maximum $35,000 for the period January 1, 2011 to March 31, 2011 utilizing any unexpended funding under the current Homelessness Partnering Strategy ending March 31, 2011;

AND FURTHER THAT the Operating Budget for Social Planning, Policy and Program Administration be increased by $331,354 gross and $0 net, for the year 2011 as outlined in Report SS-11-012, dated March 8, 2011.

5. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve entering into an extension of the funding Agreement in the additional amount of up to $57,963 with the Federal Government of Canada or a Ministry or agency thereof for continued local coordination of the Homeless Individuals and Families Information System (HIFIS) for the period April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2012;

AND THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into an Agreement with the House of Friendship of Kitchener for up to $21,326 for continued delivery of certain aspects of the Homeless Individuals and Families Information System (HIFIS) for the period April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2012;

AND THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into an Agreement(s) with consultant(s), as determined by the Commissioner of Social Services from time to time, for up to a maximum of $15,600 collectively for continued delivery of certain aspects of the Homeless Individuals and Families Information System (HIFIS) for the period April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2012;

AND THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, Social Planning, Policy and Program Administration use the remaining $21,037 to offset the Region Staff time contribution to the Homelessness Individuals and Families Information System (HIFIS) and use this funding towards the further implementation of the Homelessness to Housing Stability Strategy as determined by the Commissioner of Social Services from time to time for the period April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2012;

AND FURTHER THAT the 2011 Operating Budget for Social Planning be increased by $43,472 gross and $0 net as outlined in Report SS-11-014, dated March 8, 2011.
6. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo:

(a) enter into a mutual aid agreement with other health units, as attached as Appendix “A”;
(b) provide the Medical Officer of Health and the Associate Medical Officer of Health with all necessary authority to carry out the terms and conditions of the mutual aid agreement; and
(c) enact A By-law to Appoint an Acting Medical Officer of Health, as attached as Appendix “B”,


March 8, 2011
Regional Chair Ken Seiling and Members of Regional Council

DATE: March 23, 2011

FILE CODE: A34-41

SUBJECT: Response to Ministry of Community and Social Services on Proposed AODA Integrated Accessibility Standard

RECOMMENDATION:

For Information

SUMMARY:

NIL

REPORT:

On February 1, 2011 the Ministry of Community and Social Services (MCSS) released a draft Integrated Accessibility Standard developed under the Accessibility for Ontarians for Disabilities Act, 2005 (AODA) for public review. The proposed standard outlines accessibility requirements in the areas of information and communication, employment, and transportation. In addition to releasing the proposed standard, the MCSS released proposed amendments to the AODA Customer Service Regulation and to Regulation 629 of the Highway Traffic Act.

A 45-day public review period on the proposed regulation ended on March 18, 2011. A letter of response on the proposed standard, endorsed by Corporate Leadership Team, was submitted to the MCSS on Friday, March 18, 2011. The letter of response, attached to this report as Appendix A, is submitted to Council.

Components of the proposed Integrated Accessibility Standard have been in development for over five years, since the enactment of the AODA. As each accessibility standard has been made available for public review the Region of Waterloo provided comment to the province. Most recently the Region of Waterloo submitted comment on the previous draft standard in October, 2010 (Report CL-CLK-10-012), outlining concerns with the timing and the anticipated cost for meeting compliance with the standard.

Upon release of the current version of the proposed standard, staff from various departments reviewed relevant components of the proposed standard. These include staff from Corporate Communications, Information Technology, Region of Waterloo Library, Human Resources, Procurement and Supply Services, Grand River Transit, and Licensing and Enforcement Services.

Regional staff have also been actively involved with the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) Working Group, examining the IAS and its impacts on municipalities. This group tends to evaluate the proposed regulations through a lens of supporting all municipalities, large and small. In the past, the AMO Working Group has advocated for more time, flexibility, tools, resources, and financial support for municipalities to meet the requirements. The Association of
Municipalities of Ontario was copied on the Region of Waterloo’s letter of response submitted to the MCSS.

Response to the Proposed Integrated Accessibility Standards
The Integrated Accessibility Standard is proposed to come into effect on July 1, 2011. The proposed standard outlines accessibility requirements in the areas of information and communication, employment, and transportation, and includes general requirements such as policies, planning, and training. Appendix B provides an overview of the requirements and the proposed timelines for compliance.

Penalties for non-compliance, described in the AODA, apply to the proposed standard, using a scale based on the severity of the impact of non-compliance and on the non-compliance history of the individual or organization. Penalties would apply to a maximum of $100,000 for organizations and $50,000 for individuals, per day.

Throughout the standard development process the Region of Waterloo continues to advocate for a reasonable timeline for implementation of the accessibility standards and for financial and other resources to aid with compliance. These broad comments are reflected again in the current letter of response, attached as Appendix A.

There will be a significant financial impact to implementing the proposed Integrated Accessibility Standard. The proposed enactment of the standard for July 1, 2011 is beyond the current budget year, meaning compliance with immediate requirements will need to be incorporated into current budgets. To make the cost of implementation more manageable for municipalities, it is recommended that the Ministry provide a number of supports, including tools and resources for implementation in a timely manner. It is also recommended that the Ministry explore potential funding options with other Ministries whose mandate most closely match particular accessibility requirements, such as funding from the Ministry of Transportation to support compliance with the transportation requirements in the proposed standard.

The immediate compliance timelines in the proposed standard are of great concern, and could potentially create a situation of non-compliance. One specific requirement regarding verbal on-board announcements as of July 1, 2011 is particularly problematic. In 2009 a comprehensive ergonomic assessment was conducted by Human Factors North Inc. for Grand River Transit, to determine the effect on the health and safety of transit operators making manual stop announcements. The assessment was initiated as a result of a work refusal submitted through the Ministry of Labour process with concerns this additional task posed a safety risk. The report concluded that “if all operators on all routes were required to announce all stops, in the worst case scenario there could be an increase of 2.8 to 5.6 crashes per year.” The immediate timeline for compliance of this provision puts the Region of Waterloo in a difficult position between meeting these accessibility requirements and the safety risk determined in the ergonomic assessment.

Implementing automated stop announcement technologies is one way to address the need for audible announcements and the risk to work safety. Currently Grand River Transit is implementing automated stop announcement technologies on all buses 12 years of age and younger. This process will result in 90% of the fleet being equipped with audible stop announcements. The remainder of the fleet is expected to be retired in the next two years. It is recommended the proposed Integrated Accessibility Standard allow for planning and implementing automated stop announcements in a reasonable timeframe, to avoid the safety risk with verbal announcements.
Requirements for providing emergency plans and for workplace emergency information will be required by January 1, 2012. This aggressive timeline is problematic because a number of steps will need to be undertaken before these requirements can be implemented, including assessing current practices, document a procedure to meet compliance, communicate any revised procedures to appropriate staff members, and implement this procedure within six months of the regulation being enacted. We recommended to the MCSS that the timelines be extended to be more achievable, allowing for a minimum of 12 months from the standard being enacted until meeting the most pressing requirements.

At the present time the Region of Waterloo is operating in compliance with the Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2001 (ODA). The ODA requires municipalities to produce an annual accessibility plan. We recommended the repeal of Section 11 of the ODA to eliminate duplicating accessibility planning requirements across both the ODA and the Integrated Accessibility Standard.

The comments regarding timelines and costs have been echoed both by the AMO Working Group and by the Transit Industry submission to the MCSS.

Considering the short timelines for implementation upon enactment of the regulation, further planning for the implementation of the proposed standard is made difficult. The draft regulations have significantly changed over time, and it is unclear exactly what will be required of municipalities until the regulation has been presented to the Government of Ontario and passed into regulation.

Next Steps
Once the Integrated Accessibility Standard is passed into regulation Regional staff will conduct an impact and costing analysis on meeting compliance. Project planning for meeting the requirements of the standard will also be undertaken, and it is expected a Multi-Departmental Initiative will be created. Regional Council will be informed of the content of the IAS, the impact and costing assessments, and the project plans as they are developed.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The Region’s involvement in providing comment on the proposed Integrated Accessibility Regulation aligns with Focus Area 6 Service Excellence: Foster a culture of citizen/customer service that is responsive to community needs, and Strategic Objective 2: To increase access, fairness and inclusion to all Regional programs and services.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

NIL

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Many Departments at the Region provided comment on the proposed Integrated Accessibility Regulation including: Chief Administrator’s Office; Corporate Resources; Finance; Human Resources; Planning, Housing, and Community Services; Public Health, Social Services, and Transportation and Environmental Services.
ATTACHMENTS

Appendix A:  Letter of Response on Proposed Integrated Accessibility Standard
Appendix B:  Summary of AODA Implementation Timelines for Large Public Sector Organizations

PREPARED BY:  Vanessa Lopak, Social Planning Associate  
               Deb Bergey, Manager, Citizen Service

APPROVED BY:  Gary Sosnoski, Commissioner of Corporate Resources
Appendix A: Letter of Response on Proposed Integrated Accessibility Standard

March 18, 2011

Attention: The Hon. Madeleine Meilleur, Ministry of Community and Social Services
c/o Accessibility Directorate of Ontario
Ministry of Community and Social Services
777 Bay Street, Suite 601a
Toronto, Ontario, Canada
M7A 2J4

RE: Feedback on the Proposed Integrated Accessibility Standard

Dear Minister Meilleur,

For each proposed accessibility standard released by the Ministry of Community and Social Services for public review, the Region of Waterloo has provided comment to your ministry on the impacts of the proposed regulations on our municipality. We appreciate the opportunity to provide comment on the proposed Integrated Accessibility Standard released on February 1, 2011. This letter of response, outlining the Region of Waterloo’s primary concerns related to the proposed Integrated Accessibility Standard, has been compiled by Region of Waterloo staff and has been endorsed by the Region of Waterloo Corporate Leadership Team. This letter will be forwarded to our Regional Council; however the 45-day review period did not allow our Regional Council to endorse the letter before the required deadline.

Considering the evolution of the Integrated Accessibility Standard, it is apparent that the Ministry of Community and Social Services has taken steps to create a standard that is more achievable for municipalities. The changes to the information and communication requirements and the employment requirements, along with the inclusion of some useful definitions and exclusions have helped us to better understand what would be needed to meet the proposed regulation.

Our continuing concerns with the proposed regulation are with respect to timing and costing for implementation. To date the Ministry has not provided an independent regulatory impact assessment for the proposed integrated accessibility standard, making it difficult for municipalities to appropriately plan for meeting the regulation prior to its enactment. The significant financial impact for implementation continues to be a concern. We understand that the Ministry of Community and Social Services has often stated that no funding will be forwarded from the province to assist with implementation of the accessibility standards. In the absence of funding, we continue to recommend the Province provide tools and resources to aid in compliance. We also continue to recommend the Ministry explore using existing funding streams for related components to flow funding for particularly costly elements of the proposed standard, such as funding from the Ministry of Transportation to meet the transportation requirements. This would build in implementation costs with the Ministry whose mandate most closely matches the accessibility requirements.

We have serious concerns regarding the timelines for compliance in the proposed IAS. As
outlined in our previous comments to your Ministry, it is unrealistic to have immediate compliance timelines and timelines within six months of the standard coming into effect.

The seven areas for immediate compliance in the transportation standards will require us to interpret the regulation once passed, evaluate current systems, plan and implement improvements, as well as document processes, communicate changes, and train as needed. For example, providing appropriate signage for courtesy seating on conventional transit will require us to evaluate current signage on our entire fleet, order and replace signage, and communicate expectations not only to operators but to passengers. Other immediate timelines, such as that for municipal responsibilities for taxicabs, will require changes in our bylaws that need to be ratified by Council prior to being communicated with taxicab companies, and monitoring taxicabs for violations. Considering that the regulation has not been passed with little over three months before the proposed compliance deadline, there is insufficient time for us to meet our requirements.

Compliance timelines for January 1, 2012 are equally problematic as those for July 1, 2011. For example, in addition to the requirements under the transportation standard, providing accessible workplace emergency information for employees with disabilities will require us to evaluate current systems, make necessary changes, create policies, implement changes, communicate to staff, and train management. The process for documenting policies alone often takes six months in a municipality of our size, leaving no time to implement changes until after the compliance deadline.

These pressing timelines puts municipalities in a difficult position to meet compliance. Furthermore, such timelines are beyond the current budget year, and municipalities require time to incorporate the implementation of this standard into budgets. We need a minimum of 12 months from the standard coming into effect to meet the most pressing requirements.

In response to the specific requirement regarding verbal on-board announcements in the transportation standard, in 2009 a comprehensive ergonomic assessment was conducted by Human Factors North Inc. for Grand River Transit to determine the effect on the health and safety of transit operators making manual stop announcements. The need for this assessment came to light after Grand River Transit implemented a manual bus stop announcement program in January 2009. At the time a bus operator initiated a work refusal through the Ministry of Labour process with concerns this additional task posed a safety risk.

The ergonomic report concluded announcing all bus stops as compared to not announcing bus stops increases crash risk and recommended this requirement be delayed until an automatic stop announcement system was installed. The report concluded; “if all operators on all routes were required to announce all stops, in the worst case scenario there could be an increase of 2.8 to 5.6 crashes per year.” A copy of this report is available to the Accessibility Directorate of Ontario for review.

We have continued concerns regarding the immediate timeline for implementing verbal stop announcements in light of this ergonomic assessment. This requirement puts the Region of Waterloo in a difficult position between accessibility and work safety. We recommend the MCSS remove this requirement based on the safety risk to operators, and allow for transportation service providers to work towards installing automatic stop announcement systems.

Lastly, considering the accessibility plan requirements outlined in the integrated accessibility standard, the Region of Waterloo recommends that Section 11 of the *Ontarians with Disabilities*
Act, 2001 be repealed to alleviate some of the administrative burden of reporting on both the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005 and the Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2001. We further recommend that the accessibility planning outlined in the Transportation requirements be aligned with that for the General requirements, allowing municipalities to provide a coordinated five year plan, with annual status updates.

Should you have any questions regarding this submission, please contact:

Vanessa Lopak  
Social Planning Associate  
Region of Waterloo  
Citizen Service, Council and Administrative Services  
519-575-4757 ex 3861  
519-575-4608 (TTY)  
vlopak@regionofwaterloo.ca

Thank you once more for providing opportunity to give feedback on the proposed Integrated Accessibility Standard. We look forward to working with the Ministry to implement this important and groundbreaking piece of legislation.

Sincerely,

Kris Fletcher  
Director, Council and Administrative Services / Regional Clerk

CC: Association of Municipalities of Ontario
**Appendix B: Summary of Timelines for Large Designated Public Sector Organizations**

**All timelines are for January 1 of the specified year, except where indicated**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Information/Communication</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 1, 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-functioning accessibility equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Non-functioning accessibility equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Courtesy seating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Courtesy seating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-boarding announcements (verbal, upon request)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pre-boarding announcements (verbal, upon request)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On-board announcements (verbal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• On-board announcements (verbal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Origin to destination services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Origin to destination services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Duties of municipalities, taxicabs (fees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>• Emergency Procures, Plans, or Public Safety Information</td>
<td>• Workplace Emergency Response Information</td>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of information on accessibility equipment, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Availability of information on accessibility equipment, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency procedures and response policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Emergency procedures and response policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• General responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transit stops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Transit stops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Storage of mobility aids, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Storage of mobility aids, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Companions and children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Companions and children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Duties of municipalities, taxicabs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>• Policies</td>
<td>• Public Libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accessibility Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Procurement and Acquisition of Goods, Services, Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative accessible method of transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accessibility Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Public Libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Service Disruptions (July 1, 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accessibility Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fee parity (for the Region)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Alternative accessible method of transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hours of service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinated services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Service delays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hours of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Requirements re: grab bars, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Service delays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Floors and carpeted surfaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requirements re: grab bars, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Information/Communication</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>• Kiosks Training</td>
<td>• Feedback</td>
<td>• Recruitment</td>
<td>• Accessibility Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Notice to Successful Applicants</td>
<td>• Fares, support persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Informing Employees of Supports</td>
<td>• Eligibility application process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Accessible Formats and Communication Supports for Employees</td>
<td>• Emergency or compassionate grounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Documented Individual Accommodation Plans</td>
<td>• Booking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Return to Work Process</td>
<td>• Trip restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Performance Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Career Development and Advancement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Redeployment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>• Accessible Formats and Communication Supports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>• Accessible Website Content – W3C WCAG 2.0 Level A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Pre-boarding announcements (electronic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>• Accessible Website Content – W3C WCAG 2.0 Level AA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• On-board announcements (electronic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Criteria for eligibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REGION OF WATERLOO
TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
Transportation

TO: Regional Chair Ken Seiling and Members of Regional Council
DATE: March 23, 2011
FILE CODE: C13-30/A&R

SUBJECT: NOISE ASSESSMENT REVIEW FOR PROPERTIES ON GRANGE COURT, PITFIELD COURT, CARDIFF STREET AND HEATHCLIFFE PLACE BACKLOTTING ONTO IRA NEEDLES BOULEVARD

RECOMMENDATION:

For information.

SUMMARY:

Regional Council at their meeting on February 23, 2011 heard a delegation regarding noise issues on Ira Needles Boulevard and directed staff to report back on this issue at the March 23, 2011 Council meeting.

In December 2007, the construction of Ira Needles Boulevard from Victoria Street to south of Erb Street was completed. As part of the Environmental Assessment Study for this project a Noise Study, under Section 5.5 Part B of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo Implementation Guideline for Noise Policies (Existing Development Impacted by Proposed Regional Road Undertakings), was undertaken for the properties on Grange Court, Pitfield Court, Heathcliffe Place and Cardiff Street that backlot onto Ira Needles Boulevard. This study concluded that a noise barrier was not warranted as part of this project. Appendix A includes a copy of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo Implementation Guideline for Noise Policies.

Since that time there have been a number of concerns raised by residents in this area relating to traffic noise along Ira Needles Boulevard. In response to these concerns, Region staff proceeded to undertake a noise assessment review of this area to determine if a noise barrier was warranted.

Region staff completed the detailed noise assessment review based on Section 5.5, Part B of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo Implementation Guideline for Noise Policies. For this review the “revised” noise level was calculated using current traffic data. Based on the results of this review it was determined that the “revised” noise level does not warrant the installation of a noise barrier under Part B of the Noise Policy however under Part C of the policy a noise barrier is warranted for all the Noise Sensitive Locations.

REPORT:

Regional Council at their meeting on February 23, 2011 heard a delegation regarding noise issues on Ira Needles Boulevard and directed staff to report back on this issue at the March 23, 2011 Council meeting.
The construction of Ira Needles Boulevard from Victoria Street to south of Erb Street was completed in December 2007. As part of the Environmental Assessment Study for this project a Noise Study, under Section 5.5 Part B of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo Implementation Guideline for Noise Policies (Existing Development Impacted by Proposed Regional Road Undertakings), was undertaken for the properties on Grange Court, Pitfield Court, Heathcliffe Place and Cardiff Street that backlot onto Ira Needles Boulevard. This study concluded that a noise barrier was not warranted as part of this project.

Since that time there have been a number of concerns raised by residents in this area relating to traffic noise along Ira Needles Boulevard. In response to these concerns, Region staff proceeded to undertake a noise assessment review of this area to determine if a noise barrier was warranted.

Under Section 5.5, Part B of The Regional Municipality of Waterloo Implementation Guideline for Noise Policies where it has been the decision of Regional Council not to include noise attenuation barriers as part of a road undertaking, affected residents may request the Region to review the need for a noise barrier within 5 years of the road construction. Since noise attenuation barriers were not recommended as part of the construction of Ira Needles Boulevard in the vicinity of the properties on Grange Court, Pitfield Court, Heathcliffe Place and Cardiff Street that backlot onto Ira Needles Boulevard in 2007, Region staff has undertaken a review on whether noise barriers are warranted under Section 5.5 of the Noise Policy. For this review, the “revised” noise level was calculated using current traffic data. The need for a noise barrier was determined by using Section 4.2 of the Policy (as noted below), where the “projected” noise level is replaced with the “revised” noise level. If the review shows the need for a noise barrier, and residents, Area Municipal Council and Regional Council are in agreement; the noise barrier would be constructed and paid for by the Region.

Section 4.2 of the Noise Policy

- where the noise level in ten (10) years exceeds 65 dBA; or
- where the projected noise level in ten (10) years exceeds 60 dBA and the difference between the existing and projected noise levels is 5 dBA or more.

As part of this review, Region staff updated the traffic volumes. Figure 1 below compares the original 2004 Noise Study existing and projected Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) volumes to the updated 2010 AADT volumes. For this noise study review the actual 2010 AADT volumes replace the projected 2012 AADT volumes used in the original study.

![Figure 1](image-url)
Utilizing the Ministry of the Environment’s STAMSON computerized model, the 2010 AADT volumes were used to calculate the “revised” sound levels for the daytime (7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m.) period for the outdoor living area of each selected property. The results of the noise analysis review have been compared the existing noise levels without Ira Needles Boulevard and projected 2012 noise levels in Figure 2.

![Figure 2](attachment:un_attenuated_daytime_noise_levels.png)

By replacing the “projected” noise level with the “revised” noise level the daytime outdoor noise level is the same or 1 to 2 dBA lower than the projected 2012 noise levels. It should be noted, even though the 2010 traffic volumes are higher than the projected 2012 traffic volumes, the noise levels are not higher due to the fact that the percentage of commercial vehicles are lower and that the noise assessment review incorporated the existing property line and outdoor living area elevations. Based on this noise assessment review, a noise barrier is not warranted under Part B of the Region’s Noise Policy since:

- the revised noise level does not exceed 65 dBA; or
- where the revised noise level exceeds 60 dBA the difference between the existing noise levels without Ira Needles Boulevard and revised noise level is not greater than 5 dBA.

As part of the noise assessment review staff asked the consultant to calculate what traffic volume would be required on Ira Needles Boulevard in order to have the “calculated outdoor road noise level” at a noise level that would meet the warrants of Part B of the noise policy. It was determined that a traffic volume of 23,850 AADT would be required if the same percentage of commercial vehicles was used as in the 2010 Noise Study. The noise policy under Part B allows for a review of the need for a noise barrier within 5 years of the road construction and in this case it would be 2012. A noise review was also undertaken using the projected 2012 traffic volume of 17,900 AADT for this section of INB. The results are shown in Figure 3 and they do not meet the warrants for a noise wall under Part B of the noise policy. As a result of the commercial development in this area, Region staff is currently updating traffic projections on Ira Needles Boulevard which will be completed by June or July of this year.
It should be noted, that at all the above Noise Sensitive Locations (see Appendix B) the revised noise level exceeds 60 dBA. Under Part C of The Regional Municipality of Waterloo Implementation Guideline for Noise Policies (Existing Development Impacted by Noise from Existing Developments) these locations would warrant the installation of a noise barrier. If the property owners in this area are interested in pursuing this option, the full cost of designing and constructing the noise barrier would be shared between the property owners and the Region in the following way:

- 50% affected property owners; and
- 50% Region.

If the affected property owners wish to pursue this option, the Region has determined the noise barrier would be vary between 2.0 to 3.2 metres in height for the Noise Sensitive Locations as shown in Figure 4. This noise barrier would involve 20 residential properties that are currently backlotting onto Ira Needles Boulevard (total length is approximately 460 metres in length). Currently the cost of designing and installing a noise barrier is approximately $460 per square metre. Based on a noise barrier of 460 metres in length with an average height of 2.6 metres it is expected the total cost of this noise barrier would be approximately $550,000. This noise barrier would meet the requirements of attenuating the daytime outdoor living area noise level by 5 dBA or more, to less than 60 dBA. As well, since the height of the wall in some areas will be greater than the maximum wall height of 2.4 metres permitted under the City of Waterloo By-law #05-88, the City of Waterloo would need to approve a wall height exemption. It should be noted that when the 2012 projected traffic volumes where used as part of this 2010 Noise Study the noise barrier height would need to increase in height from 3.2 metres to 3.7 metres at 665 Heathcliffe Place. The reason for this increase is a result of the higher dBA achieved with the projected 2012 traffic volumes requiring a higher barrier to mitigate the noise levels by 5 dBA.
The width of the properties backlotting onto Ira Needles ranges from 6 to 50 metres with a total noise barrier cost per property somewhere between $7,200 and $60,000 (assuming and average noise barrier height of 2.6 metres). It should be noted that the 6 metre wide properties are located on Grange Crescent while the properties north of Grange Crescent average width is approximately 37 metres.

Regional staff would then arrange a meeting with the affected property owners, Area Municipal staff and a Regional Councillor representing the Area Municipality to:

- Describe the situation, the individual noise attenuation options available to the property owners and the potential noise barrier solution;
- Outline the Local Improvement Act requirements, the benefitting properties and the approximate costs;
- Discuss whether the residents are interested in a barrier, and whether the Area Municipality would accept a barrier in that location;
- Determine who will represent the property owners; and
- Identify the next steps.

If there is general agreement to proceed, Regional staff will notify all the affected residents and establish a deadline for receiving a petition signed by at least two-thirds of the affected residents representing at least 50% of the property value in accordance with the Act.

Following the response deadline, Region staff would prepare a report for Regional Council, copied to the property owners, with the results of the response, and recommending construction of a noise barrier if sufficient residents support the proposal. Regional Council will circulate the report to the Area Municipal Council prior to considering the recommendation. If approved by Regional Council, Region staff would proceed to contract out the design and construction of the noise barrier. All of these costs, as well as financing costs will be cost-shared between the Region and affected residents (50%/50%). At the completion of the construction of the noise wall, Region staff would inform the property owners of the final cost and the Area Municipality would add the appropriate amount to the tax bill of the property owners, and reimburse the Region as the funds are collected.

Another option the property owners could consider would be to place sections of fencing constructed of high quality wood close to where the noise is heard, such as along individual patios. This could be a lower cost solution that would provide noise attenuation and would be totally within the resident’s power to design and implement.
It should be noted that on December 9, 2010 a letter was sent to all the residents on Grange Court, Pitfield Court, Heathcliffe Place and Cardiff Street that backlot onto Ira Needles Boulevard informing them of the results on the preliminary noise assessment review.

Other Issues

1) Background on how the existing Noise Policy was developed.

The existing Regional Municipality of Waterloo Implementation Guideline for Noise Policies was adopted by Regional Council in 1999 as the final step of a multi-year review of the Region’s policies regarding the assessment and mitigation of noise from roads and railways. The Area Municipalities, development community and members of the public had been broadly consulted during the development of these policies. Area Municipal and Consultant members of a Working Group had reviewed the proposed changes and public notification through the newspaper and mailings to anyone who expressed interest in this Guideline was done prior to Council approval.

In addition, the Implementation Guideline proposed a new set of policies which would apply when residents raised concern about noise from existing Regional roads (Part C-Existing Development Impacted by Noise from Existing Roads). The overall intent of this Implementation Guideline was to discourage the use of noise attenuation barriers (both noise walls and berms). At the time, it was felt by some Regional Council members that noise barriers, particularly noise walls, were not consistent with such initiatives as crime prevention, improved transit access, and neo-traditional neighbourhoods. Other members noted that noise barriers do serve a valid purpose in certain situations and may be the only means available to ensure the safety and comfort of residents. Overall, it was generally agreed that noise barriers can not be eliminated as an option, but that policies should focus on alternatives such as land use setbacks.

Since adding Part C to the Implementation Guideline only one property backlotting onto Dundas Street has been approved by Regional Council for a noise barrier under this section. The Region paid 100% of the total cost for this noise barrier based on the extenuating circumstances clause under Part C, section 1.5. The extenuating circumstance was this road was previously owned by the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) and the residents outdoor living area was located 4.6 metres (15 feet) from the edge of Dundas Street and when the road was widened by the MTO a Noise Study was not undertaken. Currently the noise issue along this section of Ira Needles Boulevard is not unlike requests for noise barriers along Regional roads such as, Erb Street, Ottawa Street, Bleams Road, Lackner Boulevard, Homer Watson Boulevard, University Avenue, Can-Amera Parkway and Fischer-Hallman Road.

In 1999, when the policy was adopted by Regional Council, it was estimated that there were approximately 38 kilometres of Regional roads where residents may request noise barriers at that time or in the future as traffic volumes increase. These sections met the following criteria: backlotted development; high existing or forecast traffic/truck volumes; located in an urban area; subject of noise complaints. Region staff has recently undertaken a second review of the locations where residents could request noise barriers since there has been significant growth in the Region since 1999 and it has been determined that there are approximately 55 linear kilometres where residents could request noise barriers and be warranted under Part C of the Guideline, It should be
noted, that it is not expected that noise barriers would be requested along all of these sections but if they were requested and warranted under Part C of the Guideline, the total cost of installing noise barriers in these locations would be in the range of $45 to $55 million.

2) Complaints relating to the Ira Needles Commercial Centre (The Boardwalk)

The Region and the City of Waterloo have received a number of complaints relating to amount of dust and noise and lighting levels relating to the Ira Needles Commercial Centre (the Boardwalk) that is currently under construction on the west side of Ira Needles Boulevard in this area. City of Waterloo staff has been responding to complaints as they have been received by contacting the consultant and contractor for the development. It should be noted that a noise wall in this location does not address any issues related to noise from the development.

3) Why does the new development north of Heathcliffe Place warrant a noise berm while the existing properties on Grange Court, Pitfield Court, Heathcliffe Place do not warrant a noise barrier?

New developments are covered under Part A (New Developments Impacted by Noise from Roads and Railways) of the Guidelines for Noise Policies. Under this part of the policy a noise berm is warranted based on the projected 10 year outdoor noise level and future berm was warranted since the projected outdoor noise level exceeded 60 dBA.

Costs for noise walls and berms for new development are borne by the developer with presumably full cost of the wall or berm recovered from the eventual purchaser of homes. Included in the price of the noise wall is a requirement to provide 55% of the cost of replacing the noise wall in the future. In essence the full cost of the noise wall or berm and 55% of the cost for future replacement of the noise wall is paid for by the home purchaser.

4) Future road widening of Ira Needles Boulevard

Currently Ira Needles Boulevard from Highview Drive to Erb Street is scheduled in the draft 2011 Transportation Capital Program to be widened equally on both sides of the road in 2019. It should be noted, based on the traffic growth on this section of Ira Needles Boulevard the widening may actually occur earlier than 2019.

It should be noted, since the centreline of the road will remain at the same location, the noise source (centreline of the road) distance to the noise receiver (outdoor living area) will be unchanged and noise levels will vary entirely based on traffic volume and percentage of commercial traffic.

As part of this road widening another Noise Study would be required under Part B of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo Implementation Guideline for Noise Policies (Existing Development Impacted by Proposed Regional Road Undertakings). Based on the results of this Noise Study a noise barrier would be installed (100% Region’s cost) if the Part B warrants are met.
CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This report addresses the Region’s Strategic Focus Area 5: Infrastructure and the following Corporate Strategic Objectives.

- 5.2 – provide infrastructure needed to accommodate growth

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The cost to install a noise barrier in the vicinity of Grange Court, Pitfield Court, Heathcliffe Place and Cardiff Street is approximately $550,000 assuming an average barrier height of 2.6 metres and length of 460 metres. Part C of the Noise policy states that the cost of the noise wall will be shared 50% by the affected residents and 50% by the Region unless there are extenuating circumstances and Regional Council adjusts the cost sharing formula. The draft 2011 Transportation Capital Program includes $250,000 in 2011 for the Region’s share of noise wall retrofits and repairs.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

NIL

ATTACHMENTS:


Appendix B - Map showing the Ira Needles Boulevard at Grange Court, Pitfield Place, Cardiff Street and Heathcliffe Place.

PREPARED BY: Rob Gallivan, Manager, Transportation Program Development

APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
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IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINE FOR NOISE POLICIES

PART A

NEW DEVELOPMENT IMPACTED BY
NOISE FROM ROADS AND RAILWAYS

PREAMBLE

The Regional and Area Municipalities recognize that excessive noise levels generated by roads and railways are an environmental concern that must be addressed through the planning and development application processes. The preferred approach is the use of passive noise mitigation measures such as:

- increased building setbacks;
- residential front lotting;
- neo-traditional street layout and design; and
- buffering with noise insensitive land uses.

The use of such measures rather than noise barriers is encouraged in order to support improved community safety and pedestrian access, and to reduce noise barrier maintenance costs. However, the final selection of appropriate noise attenuation measures in each situation needs to be balanced with other development and design considerations. This approach is supported by the municipalities' planning documents, development application procedures, special policies, and this Implementation Guideline.

1. PURPOSE

1.1 The purpose of Part A of the Implementation Guideline is to state the details of how Policies 11.9.1 to 11.9.3 in the Regional Official Policies Plan will be implemented. This Implementation Guideline describes the process of assessing noise impacts, the responsibilities of the various parties, and the procedure for implementing noise attenuation requirements.

1.2 Chapter 11, "Transportation Opportunities" of the Regional Official Policies Plan (1996) contains the following policies concerning the impact of noise from roads and railways on new residential development:
11.9.1 The Noise Criteria shown in Table 11.1 of this Plan will be applied when assessing the noise impact of Existing Roads, or Planned Roads or railways on noise sensitive land uses proposed in any development application.

**TABLE 11.1**

**Noise Criteria for Noise Sensitive Land Uses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receiver Category</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Road Traffic</th>
<th>Rail Traffic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Living Area</td>
<td>0700 - 2300</td>
<td>Leq = 55 dBA</td>
<td>Leq = 55 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Living Area</td>
<td>0700 - 2300</td>
<td>Leq = 45 dBA</td>
<td>Leq = 40 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Living Area (Sleeping Quarters)</td>
<td>2300 - 0700</td>
<td>Leq = 40 dBA</td>
<td>Leq = 35 dBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leq means average sound level
dBA is a unit of measurement for sound levels

11.9.2 Where projected noise levels exceed the Noise Criteria shown in Table 11.1, appropriate warning and/or attenuation measures will be required as a condition of development application approval and in accordance with the Regional Implementation Guideline relating to noise mitigation. Such measures may include site design and building layout, noise warning clauses, noise attenuation barriers, air conditioning, and/or structural design measures such as multiple glazing and brick wall construction. Notwithstanding the above, noise sensitive land uses will be prohibited where the projected attenuated daytime noise level in the associated outdoor recreation area exceeds 70 dBA.

11.9.3 The Region will require consideration of passive noise mitigation measures during the preparation of development applications as a means of reducing the use of structural mitigation measures such as noise barriers.

2. **SCOPE AND RESPONSIBILITY**

2.1 This Implementation Guideline applies to the following noise sources:

- Existing or Planned Regional Roads
- Arterial and Major Collector roads under jurisdiction of an Area Municipality
- Provincial Highways
- Railways

2.2 This Implementation Guideline does not apply to other noise sources such as air traffic, rail yards, industrial or commercial activities. Where new noise sensitive development is impacted by such noise sources, the noise levels must be assessed separately from road and rail impacts in accordance with MOE guidelines such as LU-131, "Noise Assessment Criteria in Land Use Planning" (as amended). Required mitigation measures will take into account noise from all sources.

2.3 This Implementation Guideline applies when new noise sensitive development is proposed through Official Plan Amendments, Secondary or Community Plans, Plans of Subdivision, or other development applications reviewed or approved by the Region.
2.4 Responsibility for ensuring that new noise sensitive development is not adversely affected by anticipated noise impacts from nearby road and rail sources has been transferred to the Regional Municipality by the Ministry of the Environment (MOE). The noise level criteria and attenuation measures detailed in this Implementation Guideline are generally consistent with criteria established by MOE through publication LU-131 (as amended). This guideline will apply in cases where it is more specific than MOE guidelines.

2.5 Proponents of new noise sensitive development are, in general, responsible for:
- assessing future noise impacts on the proposal from all nearby noise sources;
- preparing development proposals which avoid the use of noise barriers wherever possible;
- submitting the appropriate studies and information;
- ensuring that the required noise control measures are incorporated into the plans and built accordingly;
- contributing to a Regional barrier replacement fund for the future replacement of the noise wall, if one is required on Regional property; and
- certifying that the required noise control measures have been built in accordance with the agreements with the Region and/or Area Municipality.

2.6 The noise consultant is responsible for: obtaining current information; applying professional expertise in performing calculations, making detailed and justified recommendations; and submitting the Consultant Noise Study Declaration and Owner/Authorized Agent Statement with the Noise Study.

2.7 The Region is responsible for: commenting on the need to assess noise impacts; determining whether proposed noise attenuation measures are acceptable to the Region; and implementing such measures through appropriate conditions of approval.

2.8 The Area Municipality is responsible for: commenting on the acceptability of proposed noise attenuation measures with respect to Area Municipal policies; and implementing such measures through appropriate conditions of approval where the noise source is not a Regional road.

3. DEFINITIONS AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Noise Prediction

3.1.1 Noise levels must be calculated using procedures approved by the Ministry of the Environment and Energy.

3.1.2 Calculations are done for both the Daytime (7 am to 11 pm) and Nighttime (11 pm to 7 am) periods. The daily traffic volume is apportioned to these periods based on the type of noise source.
3.1.3 Road traffic forecasts and truck percentages for Regional roads should be obtained from the Regional Engineering Department, Corridor Planning. Provincial and Area Municipal road data may also be available from Regional Engineering, or the specific agency may have to be contacted.

3.1.4 Where the noise source is an adjacent rail line, the typical train configuration (number of cars and engines) and projected frequency of movements as determined by the category of the rail line, the existing use and expected future use, are used. The appropriate railway authority should be contacted for the information.

3.1.5 Where new noise sensitive development is impacted by road and rail noise, the noise levels will be combined prior to determining noise control measures.

3.1.6 For the purpose of Tables A-2 and A-3, the projected indoor noise level is defined to be 10 dBA less than the noise level calculated at the exterior plane of the window. The rail noise criteria for Living Areas are used only for the determination of building component requirements (Table A-3).

3.2 Noise Sensitive Uses

3.2.1 Noise Sensitive Land Uses: Uses which may be adversely impacted by noise from transportation sources, including residential developments, seasonal residential developments, and hospitals, nursing/retirement homes, schools and day-care centres.

3.2.2 Outdoor living area: An outdoor amenity area where the enjoyment of the outdoor environment is important. Such areas may include:

- the backyard or patio within 3 metres of the rear wall of a residential unit, or the recreational area designated on the development application;
- the common outdoor area allocated for recreational purposes outside residential buildings such as apartments or condominiums;
- balconies (see below); and
- parks and open spaces identified by the Area Municipality for passive recreation purposes within a plan of subdivision.

The minimum outdoor area recommended by MOE for noise control purposes is:

- single family - 56 square metres (600 square feet)
- semi-detached - 46 square metres (500 square feet)
- townhouse - 37 square metres (400 square feet)

3.2.3 Balconies are considered part of the outdoor living area where they are the only outdoor living area for the occupant and meet the following conditions:

- depth greater than 4 metres;
- outside the exterior building facade; and
- unenclosed.
3.2.4 Indoor living area: An area within the housing unit where the enjoyment of quiet conversation and sleeping is important. It includes:

- living rooms (assumed to be at ground level for single detached, semi-detached and town houses);
- sleeping quarters (assumed to be on the second floor for single detached, semi-detached and town houses, unless otherwise indicated);
- the living rooms and sleeping quarters for each floor of a multi-storey building.

3.3 Required Noise Control Measures

3.3.1 Where the projected noise level exceeds the daytime or nighttime Noise Criteria (also called Regional Noise Level Objectives) shown in Table 11-1 of the ROPP, the required noise control measures are stated in Tables A-1, A-2 and A-3, and further defined below. Note that, in order to account for the special characteristics of railway sound (high pass-by sound level for short periods, and major low frequency component) the indoor sound level criteria for rail are used to determine building component requirements. Whistle noise is excluded in the determination of projected rail noise when assessing outdoor, ventilation, and noise warning clause requirements, but included when assessing building component requirements.

3.3.2 Noise Warning Clause: Since sensitivity to noise varies among individuals, the projected noise level may be allowed to exceed the noise level objective by up to 5 dBA without attenuation provided that a clause warning future occupants of the potential noise concern is included in the Regional or Area Municipal Development Agreement whereby the owner agrees to advise future owners or tenants through all offers of purchase and sale, and rental agreements.

3.3.3 Passive Noise Control Measures: Measures which do not require the construction of a noise barrier (wall and/or berm) to provide attenuation. These include noise insensitive land uses, road/lot configuration, and building design. Area Municipalities may differ on the extent to which passive noise control measures must be pursued.

3.3.4 Active Noise Control Measures: These are considered to be acoustic walls and/or berms, which are collectively referred to as noise barriers. Noise barriers located along the road right-of-way are not the preferred method of noise control. Area Municipalities may choose to restrict the use of noise barriers for noise control and require the use of passive noise control measures instead. Where a noise barrier is required, the Daytime noise level in the Outdoor Living Area must be attenuated to 60 dBA or less.

3.3.5 Provision for air conditioning: Units with this requirement must be designed to allow future occupants to install central air conditioning which will provide alternative ventilation if windows must be closed to reduce interior noise levels. In general, a forced air ducted heating system suitably sized and designed to permit the future installation of a central air conditioning system by the occupant is required. A sentence will be added to the Noise Warning Clause to notify future occupants of this provision. The provision for, or installation of, window or through-the-wall box air conditioners is not generally acceptable as a means of satisfying the requirement for air conditioning.
3.3.6 Central air conditioning or provision of alternate ventilation: Central air conditioning is required where projected interior noise levels are more than 10 dBA in excess of the noise level objectives, so that windows may be closed to provide effective noise attenuation.

However, where central air conditioning or provision for central air conditioning is required, the Proponent may propose an alternative means of mechanical ventilation, provided that it is specified in the Noise Study, and that the Study includes an assessment of the proposed system. In such cases, the Study will:

a) describe the proposed ventilation system and indicate that the system will provide an acceptable environment within the dwelling units to the satisfaction of the Area Municipality;

b) provide assurance that the system as approved by the Area Municipality will meet all relevant codes and standards;

c) certify that the system will not have any adverse effect on the acoustical environment of the dwelling units, and that it will allow the windows to remain closed; and

d) demonstrate that the installation of, or provision for, central air conditioning is not feasible for economic or other reasons.

Where a relatively complex or unusual ventilation system is proposed, it is necessary to have a specialist in the field of heating ventilation and air conditioning design the system and sign the Report.

3.3.7 Building components designed to achieve indoor sound level criteria: Special wall, window and door construction that exceeds Ontario Building Code specifications may be required as determined by the Acoustic Insulation Factor (AIF) or Sound Transmission Class (STC). The recommendations must comply with local regulations; it should be clearly stated how the recommendations differ from Ontario Building Code requirements.

3.3.8 Brick veneer (EW5) or acoustical equivalent is required for the exterior wall (facing the rail line) of the first row of dwellings adjacent to the rail line if they are within 100 m of the rail line and the Leq(24) at the plane of the bedroom window exceeds 60 dBA.

3.4 Other

3.4.1 Regional Development Agreement: An Agreement between the Proponent and the Region, registered on title, prepared by the Region at the expense of the Proponent.

3.4.2 Proponent: Person / group / company seeking approval to develop a specific property.

3.4.3 Noise Study: Determination of the extent and type of noise attenuation measures.
### TABLE A-1: NOISE CONTROL REQUIREMENTS FOR OUTDOOR LIVING AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected Outdoor Noise Level</th>
<th>Exceeds Objective By</th>
<th>Noise Control Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daytime - Leq(16)* (0700 - 2300)</td>
<td>1-5 dBA</td>
<td>• Noise Warning Clause (NWC) (Policy 6.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60 dBA</td>
<td>1-5 dBA</td>
<td>• Alternative Land Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+ dBA</td>
<td>6+ dBA</td>
<td>• Alternative Draft Plan Designs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Possible NWC in conjunction with other measures (Policy 6.1,6.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE A-2: VENTILATION REQUIREMENTS FOR INDOOR LIVING AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected Indoor Noise Level**</th>
<th>Exceeds Objective By</th>
<th>Noise Control Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daytime - Leq(16)* (0700-2300)</td>
<td>1-10 dBA</td>
<td>• Provision for air conditioning; NWC (Policy 6.1,6.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nighttime - Leq(8)* (2300-0700)</td>
<td>41-50 dBA</td>
<td>• Central A/C or other ventilation system installed prior to occupancy; NWC (Policy 6.1,6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55 dBA</td>
<td>1-10 dBA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56+ dBA</td>
<td>10+ dBA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE A-3: BUILDING COMPONENT REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected Indoor Noise Level**</th>
<th>Exceeds Objective By</th>
<th>Noise Control Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daytime - Leq(16)* (0700-2300)</td>
<td>1-10 dBA</td>
<td>• Compliance with Ontario Building Code; also see Policy 3.3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nighttime - Leq(8)* (2300-0700)</td>
<td>41-50 dBA</td>
<td>• Building components designed to achieve indoor sound level criteria; NWC (Policy 6.1,6.3); also see 3.3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road: 46-55 dBA</td>
<td>36-45 dBA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail: 41-50 dBA</td>
<td>41-50 dBA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road: 56+ dBA</td>
<td>51+ dBA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail: 51+ dBA</td>
<td>46+ dBA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include whistle noise in rail noise calculation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Projected noise levels to be rounded to nearest whole number.
** Defined as 10 dBA less than noise level calculated at exterior plane of window.
4. PRELIMINARY NOISE ASSESSMENT

4.1 Consideration of potential noise problems must commence as early as possible in the planning process with the objective of providing noise attenuation without the use of noise barriers.

4.2 Official Plan Amendments for Land Use Change

4.2.1 Potential noise problems which may result from a proposed change in land use must be identified during consideration of the Official Plan Amendment.

4.2.2 The Area Municipality will address the identified noise issue(s) and include specific provisions in the OPA or Zoning By-law as deemed appropriate.

4.2.3 The Region will review and comment on these provisions prior to approval of the Official Plan Amendment and/or Zoning By-law.

4.3 Secondary and Community Plans

4.3.1 Secondary Plans provide further policy concerning development in a specific area, and are adopted through an Official Plan Amendment. Community Plans include District, Neighbourhood Plans, Concept and Implementation Plans, and may be adopted by Area Municipal Council; such Plans can not introduce new policy. Potential noise concerns must be addressed during the development of such Plans so that the need for noise barriers in individual applications is eliminated or reduced.

4.3.2 The Region will identify potential noise concerns when advised by the Area Municipality of the initiation of the Secondary or Community Plan process. Technical details appropriate to the long-term nature of the Plan, such as long-term road traffic volumes and noise contours will be provided.

4.3.3 The Area Municipality will determine an acceptable community design, taking into account noise sources and Area Municipal policies or design guidelines concerning acceptable attenuation measures. Land use arrangements, unit types, street layout, and other measures which mitigate noise levels and reduce the future need for noise barriers will be encouraged, although it is recognized that in some limited circumstances a noise barrier may be the most acceptable alternative. The Area Municipality may include policies specifically addressing such noise attenuation measures in Secondary, District or Community Plans.

4.3.4 The Region will review and comment on the suitability of proposed noise attenuation measures prior to Area Municipal adoption of the Secondary or Community Plan.
4.4 **Subdivision Applications**

4.4.1 The Proponent must consider the impact of all potential noise sources on the development as a factor in determining the design of the plan, with the objective of providing noise attenuation without the use of physical barriers.

4.4.2 At the Pre-consultation Meeting, the Region will identify potential noise sources and advise the Proponent of the technical review and submission requirements. The Area Municipality will define the range of acceptable noise attenuation alternatives, based on Official Plan policies, the Community Plan, or approved Design Guidelines.

4.4.3 If identified at the Pre-consultation Meeting, the Proponent will submit a Noise Study for all potentially affected lands in conjunction with the Planning Report submitted with the application for Draft Approval. Noise Study submission and processing details are provided in Section 5.

4.4.4 It is recognized that, at the Draft Plan stage, some data used in the noise calculation (grades, receiver location, etc.) may require assumptions to be made, and as a result the recommended noise attenuation measures may be stated in general terms. It is the responsibility of the Proponent to ensure that the Noise Study is updated as necessary to reflect more accurate or revised information when it is available.

4.4.5 Conditions of Draft Plan Approval will include the noise attenuation measures identified in the Noise Study (including the identification of such elements as setback from noise source, unit type, road layout, etc. that contribute to noise attenuation). An updated Noise Study may be required prior to Registration to take into account final lot grading, drainage and other details.

4.4.6 For multiple unit residential Blocks, the conditions of Draft Plan Approval will require the developer to enter into a Registered Agreement with the Region, requiring that an updated Noise Study specific to the Block be completed and submitted to the Region for review and comment prior to site plan approval and issuance of a building permit. The developer may be required to enter into a supplementary agreement to implement the specific recommendations of the updated Noise Study.

4.5 **Consent Applications**

4.5.1 For consent applications involving noise sensitive uses, the Region will determine whether there is a potential concern related to noise from roads or railways.

4.5.2 Where a potential noise concern is identified, the Region will request that a Noise Study and implementation methods be required as a condition of the Consent. However, where it may not be feasible to attenuate the noise levels if the Consent were granted, the Region will request that a Noise Study be submitted by the Proponent prior to consideration of the Consent application.
4.5.3 The Region will notify the Area Municipality of the requirement for a Noise Study. The Area Municipality may decide to recommend against granting of the Consent Application if the anticipated noise attenuation measures would not be acceptable to the Area Municipality.

4.5.4 The Proponent may request deferral of the Consent Application in order to provide more detailed information to the Region to demonstrate that a Noise Study should not be required.

4.5.5 The results of the Noise Study will be implemented through an agreement between the proponent and the Region or the Area Municipality, as detailed in Section 5.

4.6 Zone Change Applications

4.6.1 For zone change applications involving noise sensitive uses, the Region will determine whether there is a potential concern related to noise from roads or railways.

4.6.2 Where a potential noise concern is identified, the Region may advise the Area Municipality that consideration of the application is premature and in conflict with the Regional Official Policies Plan until the matter of noise identification and mitigation has been addressed through the completion of a Noise Study. The area municipality will also be requested to comment on the proposed noise mitigation measures prior to final recommendations from the Region.

4.6.3 Area Municipal staff may recommend against approval of the Zone Change Application if the anticipated noise attenuation measures would not be acceptable to the Area Municipality.

4.7 Condominium Applications

4.7.1 All applications for Plan of Condominium approval will be reviewed to determine potential concerns related to noise from roads or railways. However, it is recognized that the range of feasible noise attenuation measures may be limited in the case of existing, or substantially complete, buildings.

4.7.2 The need to consider noise impacts may in some instances have been identified by the Region in its comments on the site plan application, or may be set out in registered agreement that implemented a prior Zone Change or Plan of Subdivision application.

4.7.3 Where a new multi-residential development is planned, and a future condominium application is anticipated, proponents are strongly encouraged to avail themselves of the Region's Implementation Guideline for Noise Policies so that the site and buildings are designed taking into account the need to mitigate potential road and rail noise impacts. This will avoid the possibility of having to redesign or retrofit the site or buildings to implement noise mitigation measures that may be identified during the review of the Plan of Condominium application.
5. **NOISE STUDY REQUIREMENTS**

5.1 The Noise Study must be prepared by a consultant who is currently registered on the Region’s Prequalified Consultants for Noise Studies List. If the Noise Study was not prepared by a Prequalified consultant, the consultant’s declaration must be co-signed by a consultant who is registered on the List.

5.2 An individual noise consultant will be included on the Prequalified Consultants for Noise Studies List upon the acceptance by the Regional Commissioner of Engineering of the following:

- Certificate showing that the individual has successfully completed a Ministry of Environment (MOE) course in Acoustical Technology in Land Use Planning, or its equivalent;

- Sample of two substantive Noise Studies completed by the individual within the last two years, preferably for sites in Waterloo Region, demonstrating knowledge of appropriate study content, calculation methods, and noise attenuation recommendations;

- Thorough knowledge of Regional and Area Municipal noise policies, usually demonstrated by attending a seminar or interview with Regional staff;

- Proof that the individual is a Professional Engineer (P.Eng.), Registered Professional Planner (R.P.P.) or is an employee of a Firm that holds a Certificate of Authorization license from Professional Engineers Ontario (PEO); and

- Proof of Professional Liability Insurance carried by the consultant in an amount satisfactory to the Region, as amended from time to time.

It is the responsibility of the individual consultant to advise the Region of any change in status related to the above qualifications.

5.3 A consultant will be deleted from the Prequalified Consultants for Noise Studies List for a period of two years if a peer review of the consultant’s work finds substantive deficiencies. The peer review would be initiated by Regional staff, based on concerns about technical competence, quality or sufficiency of the Noise Study. If the review finds substantive deficiencies, the original consultant will be invoiced for the cost of the review.

5.4 The Noise Study must include or be accompanied by a Statutory Declaration (see format in Appendix A) signed by the Consultant, making the following statements:

- I am a [Professional Engineer/Registered Professional Planner/employed by <name of Firm> which holds a Certificate of Authorization] and have personal knowledge of the matters set out below.

- I was retained or employed as the principal consultant to undertake the assessment of noise impacts and recommendation of noise mitigation measures for the property described as [municipal address/development application number/other identifier] in the municipality of [insert municipality].
• I had the expertise required to perform these services. Any assessment activities or recommendations requiring the application of engineering principles have been undertaken or supervised by an engineer qualified to perform such services.

• The information used in the study entitled (name of study) dated _______ is the best available information as of the date of the study.

• The noise level calculations, the interpretation of noise attenuation requirements, and the recommended measures are in accordance with Ministry of Environment and Energy Guidelines, Region of Waterloo policies, and any applicable policy or guidelines of the Area Municipality, and any other applicable policy or guideline.

• The physical noise attenuation measures proposed in this study are feasible to implement and will provide the level of attenuation indicated in the study.

• I acknowledge that this study may be subject to a peer review conducted at my cost.

• I acknowledge that public authorities and future owners, occupants and others may rely on this statement.

5.5 The Noise Study must include or be accompanied by a statement signed and dated by the owner of the property or the authorized agent, stating that:

• I am the owner of the property, or the owner's agent, and that I understand and agree with the noise attenuation measures proposed in study entitled (name of study) dated _______.

• The application has been designed to avoid the use of berms or walls as noise attenuation features where feasible. Where berms or walls are recommended, the Noise Study provides economic, planning and engineering justification.

• If the application is changed in a way that may affect the noise level calculations, I will have a revised noise study submitted to the Region.

5.6 Where a Noise Study is required under the Preliminary Noise Assessment policies of Section 4 for a Subdivision, Consent, Zone Change or Condominium Application, a 10 year traffic volume forecast will be used. For Subdivision Applications, the traffic volume forecast need not be revised in subsequent refinements of the Noise Study, provided that registration occurs within 5 years of the initial preparation (see Policy 5.12).

5.7 Where a Noise Study is required under the Preliminary Noise Assessment policies of Section 4 for an Official Plan Amendment or Secondary/Community Plan, the appropriate forecast period will be determined by Regional staff, in consultation with Area Municipal staff as necessary.

5.8 The Noise Study must include:

• the reason it is being submitted, any applicable conditions of development approval and the development application reference numbers for the site;
scale plan identifying road and rail noise sources (within 200 metres; 500 metres for Provincial Highways and stationary noise sources) as well as all other noise sources affecting the proposed development (the Proponent is responsible for confirming the noise sources identified by the Region and identifying any additional sources);

• a copy of the draft plan (for subdivision applications) or a brief description of the proposal including lot layout, lot numbers, and unit numbers;

• all data used to calculate noise levels, the noise prediction method (follow MOE guidelines) and clearly identified sample calculations;

• a concise summary of projected noise levels for outdoor and indoor living areas at appropriate receiver locations (shown on a plan) before and after mitigation measures;

• discussion of alternative subdivision layouts, site planning options and/or building design solutions considered for noise mitigation; and

• a summary sheet and a plan which clearly show the recommended noise attenuation measures for specific lots and units and how they will be implemented.

5.9 If a barrier is proposed for noise attenuation, the Noise Study must include:

• economic, planning and engineering justification for the use of a wall or berm;

• typical and worst case cross-sections, at an appropriate vertical and horizontal scale, which clearly show the barrier, the noise source, the noise receiver, and property limits;

• a grading plan of the area subject to noise attenuation measures, showing locations of cross-sections, final grades, and elevations of the edge of pavement, noise source, noise receiver, and noise attenuation features;

• drainage details;

• specification of the type, surface density and location of the proposed barrier (if adjacent to a Regional Road, must conform with policies in Section 7 of this Implementation Guideline); and

• consideration of the impact on existing trees of constructing a noise wall or earthen berm (i.e. damage to the root zone, trees destroyed) and reference to the related Tree Saving Plan.

5.10 Notwithstanding Policies 5.8 and 5.9, it is expected that the level of detail in the Noise Study will be consistent with the type of planning application and the completeness of available information about the proposal. The Noise Consultant may wish to review the scope of the Noise Study with Regional staff prior to undertaking it. Where future refinements to the application or a significant delay in its implementation are expected to affect the results of the Noise Study, a requirement to update the Study must be included in the Study recommendations.
5.11 A minimum of three copies of the Noise Study report must be submitted to the Regional Department of Planning and Culture, and two copies must be submitted to the Area Municipality. Planning and Culture staff will consult with staff from other Regional Departments and the Area Municipality as needed.

5.12 When the Noise Study is considered acceptable by all review agencies, the consultant/owner will be notified that appropriate conditions will be implemented by Regional staff through the development application approval process.

5.13 The recommendations of a Noise Study submitted prior to registration of a Plan of Subdivision will be considered valid for 5 years. If the subdivision plan is not registered within that time, the Proponent will be responsible for re-evaluating noise concerns using current data and updating the Report prior to registration.

5.14 Where the noise source is a Regional road, the recommendations of the Noise Study will be implemented through a Regional Development Agreement as detailed in Section 6.

5.15 Where the noise source is a Provincial Highway, an Area Municipal road, or a railway, the recommendations of the Noise Study will be implemented through conditions of approval and an agreement with the Area Municipality. This agreement must also make provision for the ongoing maintenance of any barriers located on private property.

6. **IMPLEMENTATION THROUGH REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT**

(Note: These policies apply where the noise source is a Regional Road. For other noise sources, the Area Municipality may choose to follow these policies, or may establish different implementation policies.)

6.1 Where attenuated or unattenuated noise levels exceed the noise criteria, the owner must enter into an agreement to include a Noise Warning Clause in offers to purchase or rental agreements. The wording for all Noise Warning Clauses is found in the document "Standard Conditions of Draft Approval", as amended.

6.2 Where provision for central air conditioning is required, the Noise Warning Clause is extended to explain the reason for inclusion of a forced air ducted heating system in the unit.

6.3 Where noise attenuation features have been installed prior to occupancy, the Noise Warning Clause is extended to state this.

6.5 Where a barrier is required, the type, location and height of the barrier will be stated in the Regional Development Agreement. Where the barrier is to be a wall, it will be a term of the Regional Development Agreement that, prior to construction, the detailed design and location of the wall must be submitted in a Noise Wall Design Report described in Section 7.2 of this Implementation Plan. The barrier will be taken into account in all grading and drainage plans.

6.6 Where a noise wall is constructed on Regional property, the Proponent will be required to pay 55% of the estimated construction cost into a barrier replacement fund, to be used to
replace the barrier in the future. This is estimated to be sufficient to provide for a one-time replacement of the barrier, assuming a 30 year life span and 2% marginal rate of return.

6.7 Where a multiple unit rental or condominium development is permitted to locate a noise barrier on its property (see Policies 7.1.2 and 7.1.3), the following clause will be included in a Regional Development Agreement to address maintenance:

"The Developer agrees to preserve the function of and to maintain the acoustic barrier located upon the lands. The purpose of the barrier is to attenuate noise from (name of noise source). The Developer agrees that the Region, through its employees and agents has the right to enter onto the lands to inspect the acoustic barrier. The Developer agrees to repair or, if necessary replace the acoustic barrier. Should the Developer fail to repair or replace the barrier upon receipt of a written notice from the Region, as the Region deems necessary, the Developer agrees that the Region may undertake such work upon the expiration of the time set out in the notice. If such work is undertaken by the Region, the Developer hereby agrees to permit entry upon the lands for this purpose and agrees to reimburse the Region fully for all costs of undertaking such work."

6.8 Where a barrier is constructed on private property within a condominium development, it shall be included as a common element of the corporation in the Declaration.

6.9 If a noise attenuation wall is required, the Regional Development Agreement will include a provision for its release when the Proponent provides an Engineer's Report to the Region's Commissioner of Engineering. This Report, submitted following construction of the noise barrier, must include:

1) test certificates for each production lot supplied to the project, showing compliance with all the requirements of the approved Detailed Noise Study Report and Noise Wall Design Report;

2) "As Built Plans" including ties to the property line, ground grades, bottom of footing elevations and top of wall elevations.

The Regional Municipality will issue a Certificate of Compliance once the report has been approved.

6.10 If noise attenuation features other than barriers (such as building set-back, building components or provision for air conditioning) have been required as conditions, the Regional Agreement will include a provision for their release when the applicant provides a report from a competent person acceptable to the Regional Municipality indicating that the measures required in the Agreement have been provided.

6.11 Where a specific distance set back has been identified as a noise mitigation measure, the Area Municipality will be required to include this set back as specific rear, side or front yard set back in the implementing zoning by-law. Where the noise source is a Regional road, this set back will also be identified in a registered agreement with the Region to serve as a notice to future owners should they wish to expand the dwelling or pursue an application to the Committee of Adjustment to reduce the specified set back.
7. **NOISE BARRIERS ADJACENT TO REGIONAL ROADS**

(Note: These policies apply where the noise source is a Regional Road. For other noise sources, the Area Municipality may choose to follow these policies, or may establish different implementation policies.)

7.1 **Noise Barrier Specifications**

7.1.1 The following criteria must be used in all noise barrier design calculations unless otherwise justified:

- height of outdoor noise receiver is 1.5 m above the ground at a point located 3.0 m from the rear wall of a dwelling unit unless an alternate outdoor recreational area is provided;

- the generally accepted maximum wall height is 2.4 metres; total barrier height may be increased by use of a berm/wall combination; barrier heights greater than 2.4 metres require consultation with Area Municipal staff and may require Area Municipal Council approval;

- barrier must be high enough to break the line of sight between the source and receiver;

- minimum wall height is 1.8 metres; and

- density of wall is 20 kg per sq. metre with no holes or gaps.

7.1.2 The following criteria must be used to determine the location of a noise barrier unless otherwise justified:

- where the barrier is a wall, it will be located entirely on Regional property, immediately adjacent to the property line;

- where the barrier is a berm, it will be located entirely on the Proponent's side of the property line; the chain link security fence will be located on the road side of the property line at the base of the berm; and an easement will be granted to the Region for the road-side half of the berm to ensure that portion of the berm is not altered;

- where the barrier is a berm/wall combination, the berm will be located entirely on the Proponent's side of the property line; the wall will be located at the top of the berm; the wall will have a minimum height of 1.8 m if it is to take the place of the chain link security fence; and the road-side half of the berm including the noise wall will be dedicated to the Region;

- berms adjacent to a Regional road will have a boulevard side slope no steeper than 3:1 (horizontal:vertical) unless approved by Regional staff; and

- where noise attenuation structures are interrupted, such as in the case of a walkway and/or property line, staggering of the barrier and/or barrier returns are required with a minimum two to one length to opening ratio.
7.1.3 Small sections of noise barriers, such as barrier returns along walkways, may be constructed on the Proponent's property without a specific agreement for maintenance in place.

7.1.4 The materials, design and detailed location of any proposed barrier must be to the satisfaction of the Region's Commissioner of Engineering.

7.1.5 Any noise wall to be located on Regional property must adhere to the Ministry of Transportation's "Material Specifications for Noise Barriers" and "Special Provisions" for construction of noise barriers on highways (or subsequent replacement documents).

7.1.6 Notwithstanding the foregoing, where the property is to be developed with multiple units under a plan of condominium or other form of single ownership, the noise barrier may be located on the private property, provided that Policies 6.7 and 6.8 are satisfied. Approval of the barrier design by the Region's Commissioner of Engineering is required; however, the Proponent may select any materials provided that the density criterion of 20 kg per square metre is satisfied.

7.2 Noise Wall Design Report

7.2.1 Prior to a noise wall being constructed, a Noise Wall Design Report must be prepared by the Proponent and approved by the Region's Commissioner of Engineering which includes:

- a grading plan approved by all applicable jurisdictions and appropriate cross-sections for the area in which the wall is to be installed;

- the soils report, shop drawings, design calculations and installation specifications; the shop drawings must show full details of the noise barrier-related items and, if applicable, connections to structures or other fences; all shop drawings shall bear the seal and signature of an Ontario Licensed Professional Engineer;

- exact colour and pattern for the noise wall;

- plans showing landscaping and method of boulevard restoration; and

- mitigation measures for any trees that may be affected by the wall, or reference to a Tree Saving Plan.

7.2.2 Portions of the Noise Wall Design Report pertaining to noise wall features, connections to structures, landscaping, tree impacts and mitigation, etc. should be reviewed with the Area Municipality prior to submission to the Region, and include a letter from the Area Municipality indicating agreement with the appropriate report components.

7.3 Noise Barrier Construction

7.3.1 The noise barrier must be installed to the satisfaction of the Regional Commissioner of Engineering within 1 (one) year of receiving a building permit from the Area Municipality for the development. Notwithstanding the above, the Proponent may apply to the Regional Commissioner of Engineering for an extension to the time required to complete the construction of the noise barrier.
7.3.2 Where a noise barrier is constructed on Regional property, the Proponent must provide the Region of Waterloo with a Letter of Credit for the total estimated cost of the barrier construction and boulevard restoration. The Letter of Credit will be released following inspection and acceptance of the noise barrier by Regional staff.

7.3.3 The Proponent must obtain a Regional Road Work Permit prior to commencing work in the Regional road allowance.
APPENDIX A: CONSULTANT STATUTORY DECLARATION

CANADA

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

In the Matter of the Environmental Protection Act and the Planning Act And in the Matter of Part Lot in the City of in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo

I, of the City of , in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, SOLEMNLY DECLARE THAT:

1. I am a (Professional Engineer/Registered Professional Planner/employed by <name of Firm> which holds a Certificate of Authorization) and have personal knowledge of the matters set out below.

2. I was retained or employed as the principal consultant to undertake the assessment of noise impacts and recommendation of noise mitigation measures for the property described as municipal address/development application number/other identifier in the municipality of

3. I had the expertise required to perform these services. Any assessment activities or recommendations requiring the application of engineering principles have been undertaken or supervised by an engineer qualified to perform such services.

4. The information used in the study entitled (name of study) dated is the best available information as of the date of the study.

5. The noise level calculations, the interpretation of noise attenuation requirements, and the recommended measures are in accordance with Ministry of Environment and Energy Guidelines, Region of Waterloo policies, and any applicable policy or guidelines of the Area Municipality, and any other applicable policy or guideline.

6. The physical noise attenuation measures proposed in this study are feasible to implement and will provide the level of attenuation indicated in the study.

7. I acknowledge that this study may be subject to a peer review conducted at my cost.
8. I acknowledge that public authorities and future owners, occupants and others may rely on this statement.

AND I make this solemn Declaration conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath.

DECLARED before me at the City of ________, in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo this ___ day of ________.
REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO

IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINE FOR NOISE POLICIES

PART B

EXISTING DEVELOPMENT IMPACTED BY

PROPOSED REGIONAL ROAD UNDERTAKINGS

1. PURPOSE

1.1 Chapter 11, "Transportation Opportunities" of the Regional Official Plan (1996) includes the following policy concerning the impact of noise from proposed Regional road undertakings:

11.9.4 The impact of noise generated by increased traffic volumes that result from proposed Regional road system expansions will be considered prior to approval of the project, where such projects are located adjacent to existing noise sensitive land uses. During the review of these projects, consideration will be given to implementing noise attenuation measures in accordance with the Regional Implementation Guideline relating to noise mitigation.

1.2 The purpose of Part B of the Implementation Guideline is to state how this policy will be implemented with respect to the scope of its application, the assessment of noise levels, the types of attenuation measures to be considered and the criteria for considering a noise barrier.

2. SCOPE AND DEFINITIONS

2.1 Proposed Regional Road Undertakings refer to proposals for the widening of an existing Regional road, or the construction of a new Regional road, adjacent to an existing developed area (i.e. already built or under Registered Plan of Subdivision) of noise sensitive land use.

2.2 Implementation of noise control measures in connection with the widening or construction of roads under Provincial or Area Municipal jurisdiction will be subject to the policies of those jurisdictions.

2.3 In all cases where a Regional road is to be widened or constructed, such work will be undertaken in conformity with the Environmental Assessment Act including noise impact assessment and mitigation.
2.4 Noise Sensitive Land Uses are defined as uses which may be adversely impacted by noise from transportation sources, including residential developments, seasonal residential developments, and hospitals, nursing/retirement homes, schools and day-care centres.

2.5 The Outdoor Living Area is defined as an outdoor amenity area where the enjoyment of the outdoor environment is important, such as:

- the backyard or patio within 3 metres of the rear wall of a residential unit; or
- the common outdoor area allocated for recreational purposes outside residential buildings such as apartments or condominiums.

2.6 Balconies are considered part of the outdoor recreation area where they are the only outdoor living area for the occupant and meet the following conditions:

- depth greater than 4 metres;
- outside the exterior building facade; and
- unenclosed.

3. **ASSESSMENT OF NOISE LEVELS**

3.1 Assessment of noise levels will be undertaken as a component of the design study for the road in question.

3.2 Existing and projected noise levels for the Daytime (7 a.m. to 11 p.m.) period will be assessed for the existing outdoor living areas affected by the proposed undertaking, using procedures acceptable to the Ministry of the Environment.

3.3 The existing noise level will be calculated using the current traffic volume. If there is no existing road, 55 dBA will be used as the existing noise level.

3.4 The projected noise level will be calculated using the 10-year traffic volume forecast, and taking into account any proposed design measures which could reduce noise.

4. **NOISE ATTENUATION MEASURES**

4.1 The types of noise control measures available for consideration include but are not limited to: location of road allowance, location of pavement within the road allowance, vertical alignment, pavement surface type, and noise barriers. In selecting the type and extent of such measures, the Region will consider: the extent of attenuation achievable; the cost of the measure relative to the attenuation achieved; and the wishes of affected residents.
In the event that non-barrier alternatives are not sufficient, construction of a noise barrier will be recommended for consideration by residents, Area Municipal Council and Regional Council in the following situations:

- where the projected noise level exceeds 65 dBA; or
- where the projected noise level exceeds 60 dBA and the difference between the existing and projected noise levels is 5 dBA or more.

The noise barrier will be designed to achieve a 5 dBA or more reduction in the Daytime Outdoor living area noise level and to reduce the projected noise level to 60 dBA or less. The proposed height, location and design to achieve these objectives will be reviewed by residents, Area Municipal Council and Regional Council.

The final decision concerning the funding and installation of a proposed noise barrier will be made by Regional Council in conjunction with the road design approval.

5. **IMPLEMENTATION AND MAINTENANCE**

5.1 The location, design, and construction of the noise barrier will be undertaken by the Region, in consultation with the Area Municipality.

5.2 The Region will be responsible for maintenance of the barrier while the road is under its jurisdiction.

5.3 If construction of the proposed undertaking does not occur within 5 years of the noise assessment, noise levels will be re-calculated and the need for a noise barrier will be re-assessed prior to construction.

5.4 Where it is the decision of Regional Council not to include noise attenuation barriers in the road undertaking, residents may consider pursuing the construction of a noise barrier through the provisions of Part C of this Implementation Guideline.

5.5 Where it has been the decision of Regional Council not to include noise attenuation barriers in the road undertaking, affected residents may request the Region to review the need for a noise wall within 5 years of the road construction. For this review, the "revised" noise level will be calculated using current traffic data. The need for a noise barrier will be determined using Policy 4.2, where the "projected" noise level is replaced with the "revised" noise level. If the review shows the need for a noise barrier, and residents, Area Municipal Council and Regional Council are in agreement, the noise barrier will be constructed by the Region.
REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO

IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINE FOR NOISE POLICIES

PART C

EXISTING DEVELOPMENT IMPACTED BY NOISE FROM EXISTING REGIONAL ROADS

1. PURPOSE AND FINANCING

1.1 The purpose of Part C is to detail how the Regional Municipality will respond to concerns raised by owners of existing noise sensitive land use about the impact of noise from an adjacent Regional Road.

1.2 Such concerns may arise as a result of increased traffic volumes, an increase in the number of heavy vehicles using the road, or failure of an existing noise attenuation measure.

1.3 Where construction of a noise barrier is identified as the preferred option by residents, the Area Municipality and Regional Council, the full cost of designing and constructing the noise wall will be shared among the residents and Region in the following way:

- 50% affected residents;
- 50% Region.

1.4 When considering the recommendation for the construction of a noise barrier, Regional Council will also establish the timing of construction, based on whether funds are available in the current budget or will need to be allocated in the budget of the following year.

1.5 In extenuating circumstances, Engineering Committee may consider a request from affected residents to adjust the cost-sharing formula. (Note: Regional Council has directed staff to consider further revisions to this policy to address residents' concerns.)

2. SCOPE AND DEFINITIONS

2.1 This Part of the Implementation Guideline applies only to Regional Road facilities as noise sources. Any noise source not controlled by the Regional Municipality (for example, air conditioner, industrial noise source) is not subject to this Guideline. It applies to noise sensitive land uses as receivers. These are defined as uses which may be adversely impacted by noise from transportation sources, including residential developments, seasonal residential developments, and hospitals, nursing/retirement homes, schools and day-care centres.
2.2 The Outdoor Living Area is defined as an outdoor amenity area where the enjoyment of the outdoor environment is important, such as:

- the backyard or patio within 3 metres of the rear wall of a residential unit; or
- the common outdoor area allocated for recreational purposes outside residential buildings such as apartments or condominiums.

2.3 Balconies are considered part of the Outdoor Living Area where they are the only outdoor living area for the occupant and meet the following conditions:

- depth greater than 4 metres;
- outside the exterior building facade; and
- unenclosed.

2.4 A noise barrier is an acoustic wall and/or earth berm. For the purpose of this Part of the Implementation Guideline, the noise barrier must be constructed within the Regional road right-of-way. In almost every case, the noise barrier will be an acoustic wall which must be constructed to Regional standards.

2.5 An "affected resident" is defined as the owner of a lot, or a condominium corporation, abutting directly on the barrier. In accordance with the Local Improvement Act, construction of the barrier must be supported by at least two-thirds of the affected residents representing at least 50% of the property value. The cost of barrier design, construction and financing will be apportioned to the affected residents and charged over a period of 10 years by the Area Municipality, on behalf of the Regional Municipality.

3. REGIONAL RESPONSE TO AN ENQUIRY CONCERNING ROAD NOISE

3.1 When a noise concern is initially raised by a resident through a letter or telephone call, it will be directed to Regional Engineering-Corridor Planning Section.

3.2 A Corridor Planning staff member will respond by describing the policies of this Guideline, and assisting the resident to understand whether the Guideline applies to their particular situation. Noise attenuation options that could be undertaken by the individual resident will be described. These include: installation of air conditioning, window upgrades, and/or installation of private noise wall. A copy of this Implementation Guideline will be provided to the resident.

3.3 Noise attenuation measures that could be undertaken by the Region will also be considered in the context of approved operating and capital programs. These may include: re-paving, signage to avoid use of engine brakes, construction of new roads to reduce traffic on existing roads, etc. Corridor Planning staff will undertake to advise the resident on the feasibility of such measures within a reasonable time period.

3.4 If the resident chooses to pursue the complaint, details of the situation must be submitted in a written format, addressed to the Region's Commissioner of Engineering.

3.5 Upon receipt of a formal complaint, it will be acknowledged by a written response from the Regional Municipality.
3.6 Regional staff will assess the situation to determine:

- applicable noise source(s)
- location and type of noise receiver
- characteristics of site
- noise-related conditions of development
- any other pertinent information

3.7 The existing noise level in the Outdoor Living Area will be calculated based on existing average daily traffic volumes for the Daytime (7 a.m. to 11 p.m.) period, using procedures acceptable to the Ministry of the Environment and Energy. *(Note: Regional Council has directed staff to consider further revisions to this policy to address residents’ concerns.)*

3.8 If the existing noise level is 60 dBA or less, the resident will be advised that this level is typical for an urban area, and that no further action will be taken by the Region.

3.9 If there were noise-related conditions of development that have not been satisfied or have failed, the resident will be advised of this. Regional staff may be able to suggest a possible course of action.

3.10 If the existing noise level exceeds 60 dBA, the resident will be advised of these results and again advised of individual options such as a privacy fence, window improvements or air conditioning that could be undertaken by the resident. No further action would be taken by the Region unless the resident again advises that he/she wishes to pursue a noise wall option.

3.11 If the noise concern is raised by residents of one or more condominium corporations, it will be recommended that the corporation construct the noise wall or undertake other attenuation measures, rather than proceed under this Implementation Guideline. This will enable the condominium corporation to select the type, design and location of the noise wall.

4. **WHERE RESIDENT PURSUES NOISE WALL OPTION**

4.1 Regional staff will document the calculations and also determine the approximate noise wall height, length and cost to attenuate the Daytime Outdoor living area noise level by 5 dBA or more, to less than 60 dBA.

4.2 Regional staff will advise all potentially directly affected residents by mail, and arrange a meeting with residents, Area Municipal staff and a Regional Councillor representing the Area Municipality. The purpose of the meeting will be to:

- describe the situation, the individual noise attenuation options available to the residents and the potential noise barrier solution;
- outline the Local Improvement Act requirements, the benefitting properties, and the approximate costs;
- discuss whether the residents are interested in a barrier, and whether the Area Municipality would accept a barrier in that location;
- determine who will represent the residents;
- identify the next steps.
4.3 If there is general agreement to proceed, Regional staff will notify all affected residents and establish a deadline for receiving a petition signed by at least two-thirds of the affected residents representing at least 50% of the property value in accordance with the Act.

4.4 Following the response deadline, a report will be prepared for Regional Council, copied to the affected residents, with the results of the response, and recommending construction of the noise barrier if sufficient residents support the proposal. Regional Council will circulate the report to the Area Municipal Council prior to considering the recommendation.

4.5 Upon decision to proceed, Regional staff will contract out the design and construction of the noise barrier. All of these costs, as well as financing costs, will be cost-shared among the parties in accordance with Policy 1.3.

4.6 Regional staff will inform the residents of the final cost. The Area Municipality will add the appropriate amount to the tax bill of each resident, and reimburse the Region as the funds are collected.
Noise Study Review Area
Ira Needles Boulevard at Grange Court, Pitfield Place, Cardiff Street and Heathcliffe Place

Legend
- Noise Sensitive Locations (NSL)
MEMORANDUM

To: Chair Sean Strickland and Members of Community Services Committee
From: David Dirks, Director, Employment and Income Support
Copies: Michael Schuster, Commissioner, Social Services
File No.: S09-80
Subject: ONTARIO WORKS CASELOAD: FEBRUARY 2011

This memorandum is provided as information for members of Council. Employment & Income Support, Social Services with Finance monitors the Ontario Works (OW) caseload and expenditures on a monthly basis. Below is a chart summarizing the caseload at the end of February 2011 with comparisons to the months of January 2011 and February 2010 as well as September 2008.

Very briefly,
- The OW caseload at February 2011 was: 8,643
- The increase from January 2011 was: 83 (1.0%)
- The increase from February 2010 was: 99 (1.2%)
- The increase from September 2008 was: 2,351 (37%)

- Waterloo Region unemployment rate for February 2011 was: 6.6%
- Waterloo Region unemployment rate for February 2010 was: 10.1%

Ontario Works Caseload and Unemployment Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>February 2011</th>
<th>January 2011</th>
<th>February 2010</th>
<th>% Change January to February</th>
<th>% Change Year to Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8,643</td>
<td>8,560</td>
<td>8,544</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unemployment Rates – Seasonally Adjusted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>February 2011</th>
<th>January 2011</th>
<th>February 2010</th>
<th>% Change January to February</th>
<th>% Change Year to Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Province</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>(1.0%)</td>
<td>(12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Region</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>(14%)</td>
<td>(35%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As revised by Statistics Canada.

This is the fifth consecutive month of caseload growth. The caseload is 37% higher than at the outset of the recession.

The provision of social assistance supports Focus Area Three of the Corporate Strategic Plan, Healthy and Safe Communities; Strategic Objective One: (to) improve health by reducing or preventing the environmental and social conditions that lead to poor health and/or poverty.

If you have any questions or comments or for further information, please contact David Dirks at Phone: 519-883-2179 or dirksdav@region.waterloo.on.ca